

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THREE complete series, with five volumes in each, have now been published under the general title of 'The Scholar as Preacher.' The fourth series begins with a volume by Dr. C. F. Burney, and now the second volume in this series has just been issued. It is *The Adventure into the Unknown*, by the Venerable R. H. CHARLES, D.Litt., D.D. The title is taken from the first sermon. The volume contains twenty sermons, all of which were preached in Westminster Abbey.

It is difficult when all are so good to choose one Sermon for special notice. We were tempted to deal with the last one, where Dr. CHARLES discusses Neutrality and its impossibility in the moral and spiritual worlds. But instead we choose his treatment of humility and meekness in the third sermon.

The subject of this sermon is the two beatitudes which are found in the 3rd and 5th verses of the 5th chapter of St. Matthew. 'Blessed are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.' 'Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth.' Dr. CHARLES begins by a consideration of the number of the beatitudes. He argues that it would be more natural to expect seven than eight, seven being a sacred number, and sacred numbers playing an important part in St. Matthew. And he gives a number of analogies. 'Thus in chapter xxiii. there are seven woes pronounced

against the religious leaders of Judaism—a fact that might suggest that there were seven beatitudes in the Sermon on the Mount. St. Matthew also groups together seven parables in chapter xiii. and seven petitions in the Lord's Prayer, whereas in St. Luke ix. 2-4 there are only five petitions. Again, in chapter i., St. Matthew deliberately omits several names in the genealogy of Christ in order to compress it into three groups each of fourteen names, i.e. six groups of seven.'

Having led us from these analogies to expect seven and not eight beatitudes, Dr. CHARLES turns our attention to the MSS. and to the fact that there is a conflicting order in verses 4 and 5, which may well point to some interpolation. 'Whereas,' he says, 'most MSS. and Versions uphold the present order of verses 4 and 5, one great uncial and the two oldest Versions reverse the order and put verse 5 before verse 4.'

Wellhausen and Professor Bacon of Yale hold that verse 5, 'Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth,' is the interpolation. They believe that this verse was first written as a gloss in the margin and then subsequently incorporated in the text by most authorities after verse 4, and by a powerful minority after verse 3.

Dr. CHARLES holds, on the other hand, that it

is verse 4, 'Blessed are they that mourn: for they shall be comforted,' which has been interpolated, and he gives two reasons.

'First of all,' he says, 'verse 4 comes in most awkwardly between 3 and 5, which are essentially related to each other, seeing that verse 5 presupposes verse 3. That is, the meekness that is commended in verse 5 presupposes the humility that is commended in verse 3. Hence we should expect verse 5 to follow immediately on verse 3. In confirmation of this close connexion between verses 5 and 3, we might quote Matt. xi. 29, where the two ideas are brought together in the same sentence: "Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and humble in heart." Nowhere else in the other three Gospels does this combination of these two graces occur.' To the objection that the words are found in St. Luke, according to the Prayer Book version of the *Magnificat*—'He hath exalted the humble and meek,' he replies that this is a corrupt reading which established itself in the Prayer-Book in the sixteenth century. The true reading is simply 'the humble.' 'Thus,' he says, 'the combination "humble and meek" belongs only to the first Gospel. Hence to read verse 5 immediately after verse 3 would be thoroughly characteristic of St. Matthew, and if any verse is to be rejected it is not verse 5 but verse 4, since it severs two ideas which are essentially allied.'

But Dr. CHARLES has a second reason. 'Even,' he says, 'if we follow the less strongly attested text and read verse 4 after verse 5, this will not be sufficient. For verse 4, "Blessed are they that mourn: for they shall be comforted," is different in form from the rest of the beatitudes in Matthew. In Matthew each class that is blessed is carefully defined, so that it is at once recognized as worthy to be blessed—the poor in spirit, the meek, those that hunger and thirst after righteousness, the merciful, the pure in heart, the peacemakers, those that are persecuted for righteousness' sake. But there is no such clearness in the words, "Blessed

are they that mourn." The class of mourners here would, if this beatitude came from St. Matthew's hand, have been as carefully defined as are the other classes in the rest of the beatitudes. For these mourners do not include individuals or nations mourning over the wreck of their baffled knaveries, or the miscarriage of their treacherous deceptions.'

If, then, we accept seven as the number of the beatitudes and hold that verse 4 is the intrusion, verses 3 and 5 come together. And this juxtaposition Dr. CHARLES finds very illuminating. We have here two classes, both of whom are blessed, 'the humble', for that is the meaning of 'the poor in spirit', and 'the meek'—'the humble', who already possess the Kingdom of Heaven, and 'the meek', who do not yet possess the earth, but who at some future time shall possess it.

Dr. CHARLES then goes on to discuss the nature of humility and the nature of meekness. 'Humility,' he says, 'does not consist in the mere absence of pretension, certainly not in a morbid self-deprecating spirit, it is no transient state of feeling into which a man may artificially work himself; rather it is a true and right estimate of ourselves, made in all soundness of mind, an estimate which Christian ethics does not require us to falsify or unjustly lower. St. Paul bids us not to think of ourselves more highly than we ought to think, but to have a right and sound judgment of ourselves.' And as the standard of Christianity is immeasurably high, being divine, every stage of fulfilment is at the best imperfect, and so from the contrast between what the Christian has done and what he ought to have done arises the Christian grace of humility. The Christian man cannot but think lowly of himself if he would think truly; for he knows that his real worth in the world is that which he stands for—not in men's sight, but in God's. If this is the nature of humility we can understand the promise given by Christ, that the humble in spirit are even now citizens of His Kingdom.

What, then, is the relationship of the second

beatitude, 'Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth,' to the first beatitude? Dr. CHARLES answers that meekness is in a sense a complement of humility, for Christian meekness is 'the outward and visible sign of the inward and spiritual grace of humility.' But meekness is more than this, for Dr. CHARLES says 'it is humility itself coming into manifestation in the sphere of human life.'

And so we see that if this is the inner spring of meekness, it can have nothing in common with weak-kneed irresolution or with any meanness of spirit. The aim of the meek man, however faulty he may be in the fulfilment of it, 'is to do God's will and not to achieve his own individual rights or vindicate his own individual claims or dignities.' Meekness requires courage, singleness of aim, self-control, self-sacrifice. And to the men who have these 'the promise of Christ naturally is: "The meek"—that is, the willing servants of God's will—"shall inherit the earth." It is not to the arrogant, the high-handed, the rapacious: it is not to the so-called super-men in this or other lands, that the earth and all that is therein shall ultimately belong, but to the humble and the meek: to those who, having sought first and above all the kingdom of God and His righteousness, find that to this eternal heritage there is added another they did not seek—even the heritage of this world and all that is best therein.'

The Bible is full of unfinished stories, both small and great. On the great scale we have the Book of Acts. The writer describes his 'former treatise' as the story of 'all that Jesus *began* both to do and to teach.' In the Acts that story is continued, but not finished. It is not finished yet. What Jesus began by Himself is continued in the Acts through Peter and Paul and others, who 'both did and taught' in His spirit. The story is continued through all the history of the Church through successive centuries from that day to this, and it will be continued in all the words and works of His

sincere representatives, the conspicuous and the inconspicuous alike, to the end of time. The Book of Acts is the greatest unfinished story of all.

But there are also short unfinished stories, some of them very short, but full of poignant meaning and challenging suggestiveness. There is the story of the Prodigal Wife of the Old Testament. Every one knows the tale of Hosea's unutterable love for his erring wife. Perhaps she had been one of the women attached to a shrine, as women may be in India to-day, and dedicated to the immoral worship so prevalent in those riotous days. In any case she was unfaithful as a wife to the man who loved her utterly, and who came to see in his own inextinguishable love for her an adumbration of the infinitely greater love of God for Israel.

He did all he could to win her back again. He bought her back for half the price of a slave and kept her under gentle restraint, in the hope that she might learn the meaning of her own grievous sin and of his mighty love. Did she respond? We do not know. 'It may be,' says Dr. T. W. CRAFER, in his recent *Commentary on Hosea* (reviewed in 'Literature'), 'that this tragedy of home had no happy ending. Or the husband's unending hope may at length have had its reward, and, accepting the two last children as his own, he took the prefix from their names and called them Ruhamah, "pitied," and Ammi, "my people." And yet, had this been the case, he would surely have tried to forget the sorrows of the past and keep them locked in his own breast. But, as he utters his message, we find him still in bitter anguish of soul.' Sad indeed it would be if such surpassing love remained unrequited to the end. It seems only too possible. But we do not know.

Then there is the unfinished story of the Prodigal Son of the Old Testament. Who is he? Unquestionably Jonah. He, too, had had experience of a love mighty to save, and he was sent by the Good Father of us all to proclaim that love to an enemy alien people. He went, but he went with

hate in his heart, a hatred heightened by the ready repentance of those to whom he proclaimed his message. What a fearful picture that of the sullen prophet, sitting comfortably in the shade of his booth 'till he might see what would become of the city.'

He kept his lonely watch in faith and hope: for perhaps the righteous God would destroy the once wicked city after all. Then come the two immortal verses which close the book, in which God, speaking to him as a man might to his friend, and appealing tenderly to the glimmer of affection for the gourd in Jonah's wicked and angry heart, sought to wake in him the feeling that Nineveh, too, lay within the Divine love and care. Were there not thousands of little folk in Nineveh who did not know their right hand from their left, and much cattle?

Was this tender appeal made in vain? We do not know. There is no record of any response. The book ends on this magnificent note, and with this soul-stirring vision of the all-comprehensive love of God. But was Jonah's soul stirred? Apparently not. At any rate the last we see of him is with a scowl upon his face, the last we hear from him is that he 'does well to be angry' at the love of God.

And then there is the Elder Brother of the New Testament in the story familiar as The Prodigal Son, but more happily entitled The Loving Father. He, too, was angry at his father's love, angry at the music and the dancing and the feasting with which the father welcomed home his penitent son. His father came out and entreated him, but he would not go in. Had he not slaved all his life, and all for nothing? In his father's house it seemed that piety was to be ignored and profligacy rewarded.

This story, like the last, closes on infinitely gracious words from the lips of the father. He loved both his sons. 'Son, thou art ever with me.' Does the elder son care nothing for that? for uninterrupted fellowship with his loving father?

Does he care nothing that his young brother has come back from the dead? for it was death to be living as he had lived in the far country. Gently, but firmly, the father defends himself for the joy with which he had welcomed back his wandering son. 'It was meet to make merry and be glad.' Was the elder brother won by this gracious appeal? We do not know. The last time we see him, he is standing outside, angry, and refusing to go in. The last words we hear from him are words of coarse indignation against the son whom he refuses to acknowledge as brother, and words of reproach against the father for his absurd love of so unworthy a son. Who is the Prodigal Son now?

These three unfinished stories have this in common, that they deal with the rejection of an exquisite love. Gomer the daughter of Diblaim, Jonah the son of Amittai, the Elder Brother—they are all alike in having been brought face to face with a Love which longed to win them and make them its own for ever; and, so far as we know, they refused to be won. That is the tragedy of tragedies—to be brought face to face with some one who is 'most wonderfully kind,' and to refuse to respond. Why should human lives deliberately elect the outer darkness? Why should such stories not end with the penitent and rapturous acceptance of so wonderful a love? The silence of the Bible shows that it knows well how hard the human heart can be.

The Church Quarterly Review for April contains an interesting article on 'The Present Value of the Earliest Christian Apologetic,' by the Rev. W. Maurice PRYKE. It is only at the very end of the article that the 'value' of this early defence of Christian belief is touched on. The substance of the article deals with the nature and justification of the apologetic.

The second Christian century is generally distinguished as the Age of Apologists. But in point of fact the missionary preaching of the primitive Christian community was characterized by a pro-

nounced apologetic tendency, and for a good reason. The cardinal point of dispute between Jew and Christian from the first was the Messiahship of Jesus. The idea of a *Christus Crucifixus* was to the Jew a glaring paradox. Yet the disciples accepted it. They had believed in the Messiahship of Jesus in His lifetime, probably before the last visit to Jerusalem. This is an important point, as will be seen in a moment.

The Cross was a blow to the disciples in spite of the Master's repeated hints, which, perhaps, were couched in less definite terms than the Gospels would lead us to suppose. What was it, then, that changed the despair of Good Friday into the triumphant conviction of Pentecost? 'The Resurrection appearances,' is the usual answer. But these provide only a partial answer. Their faith was grounded equally on their experience of the earthly life. This, however, is not the present point. The point is that neither of these reasons could convince the sceptical Jew or the ignorant Gentile. What *would* convince them?

Now the strongest objection of the Jew to the Christian position was its lack of support in the nation's Scriptures. And with remarkable intuition the early believers saw that this was the crux of the whole matter. It was vitally necessary to discover in Scripture, predictions of a Suffering Messiah fulfilled in Jesus. The Cross was to them part of the Divine plan and must have been foreshadowed in the prophets. This, therefore, was the line taken by the earliest apologists for Christianity. The Old Testament became the battleground of Jews and Christians, with the result that all primitive Christian theology is Jewish in method. The elaboration of the proof from prophecy formed in fact the real theological work of Christians in early days.

A detailed study of the speeches in the Book of Acts gives us a vivid insight into the methods of the early Christian apologist. Peter, Stephen, Philip, Paul, James, and Apollos all ground their

argument on the predictions of the Old Testament. The appeal of one and all is the proof from Scripture, which foretold a Suffering Messiah and no less clearly His resurrection, ascension, and return to glory. Acts not only furnishes us with the passages referred to, but repeatedly affirms that this was the method employed by all the missionaries.

This apologetic was not only convincing to Jews. It carried equal weight with Gentiles, proselytes, and pagans. The appeal of the Apostles to their own experience of Jesus was limited in its power. But this argument was overwhelming to those who believed in sacred and inspired Scriptures. No Jew could refuse a hearing to statements which, however improbable in themselves, were backed by such an august authority.

What value has this apologetic for us? We can no longer use the Scriptures as the early Christians did. A truer conception of the meaning of inspiration, more accurate knowledge of the authorship, composition, and character of psalms and prophets, a fuller recognition of the human element in the Divine library, a juster appreciation of the relation of a prophet's utterances to the circumstances of his own age, have destroyed for ever the cogency of the argument from prophecy as employed formerly.

'Let us then admit unreservedly that no single passage of the Old Testament, whether from prophet or psalmist, can rightly be produced as a prediction, conscious or unconscious, of the sufferings, death, resurrection, exaltation, or return to judgement of the Messiah.' Still, this early apologetic *has* one element of supreme value for us. Its value lies in its failure. The very artificiality of the Apostles' exegesis proves that their conviction of the Messiahship of Jesus was based on other and surer grounds than their Scripture proof. It rested on the firm foundation of His own transcendent personality. It was this that created the joyous faith of the early disciples.

For them facts created predictions and not

predictions facts. And this outstanding reality of the early Christian history is a confirmation of the narrative in the Gospels. It also lends strong support to the general statement of the Gospels, that the belief in the Messiahship of Jesus is to be traced to Jesus' belief in Himself. For the disciples could not have maintained their faith if they had not known it had the support of the Master.

The Rev. Walter Lock, D.D., preached 'before' the University of Oxford in February. It was a remarkable sermon on a remarkable text. The text was: 'But ye did not so learn Christ; if so be that ye heard him, and were taught in him, even as truth is in Jesus' (Eph 4²⁰⁻²¹).

Here we have laid down two subjects of study; two and not one only, though one is the pre-supposition and test of the other. And they are not alternatives; they must both be taken together. The one is the learning of the Christ, the other that of truth as it is in Jesus: the message of the Christ as based upon the historic life of Jesus.

This conjunction of the two may seem to be opposed to the conviction of Paul, who (we are told) cared little for the historic life. To him the Risen Christ was all in all. But this is a mistake. It arises from a misinterpretation of a well-known saying: 'Even though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now we know him so no more.' Here what Paul speaks of is not 'Jesus,' not even 'the Christ' but 'a Christ,' and the reference is probably to those Christians who had looked for a Christ who not only would be of Jewish descent, but would make the Jews the ruling power in His kingdom. It might include Peter, and all the Apostles before Pentecost.

Think also how careful Paul is to quote definite commands of the Lord, as about divorce or the maintenance of those who preach the Gospel—'not I, but the Lord'; think what is implied of knowledge of the earthly life in the appeal to 'the meek-

ness and large-heartedness' of the Christ as the example which he wished to imitate; or, if we may give more free play to our imagination, picture to yourself what fifteen days spent on a stay in Jerusalem, whose one object was to visit Peter, would imply; or talks with John Mark of what had happened at his mother's house in Jerusalem; or the stories Luke had collected and would impart to Paul. It is evident Paul must have known intimately the facts about Jesus.

This, then, is the first subject of study: the historic life of Jesus of Nazareth. In spite of difficulties of various kinds we know its essential features. It is recalled to us, by way both of likeness and contrast, by Gandhi's work in India. By way of likeness, in the movements from village to village, the preaching of brotherhood and sacrifice, the retirements for prayer, the eager crowds, the devoted followers. By way of contrast, in the resistance of Jesus to the terrible temptation, to which Gandhi succumbed, to turn all this to political and national ends.

We know this life then, a life of belief in God as the Father, of belief in man as the Father's child, of devotion to a great mission. And the truths we see embodied in that life must always be the guide and test of learning the Christ. For the learning of the Christ is the learning of the extension of the work of Jesus of Nazareth in His Church, of the Head in the Body, of the Inspirer in those who caught His Spirit.

We can see three stages in the learning of this lesson. The first was to pass from personal and racial divisions and hatreds to a life which should reflect the kindness of God our Saviour and His love towards man. Paul had himself undergone this change. The second was an enlarged understanding of the scope of the Gospel. First the Samaritans, then the Ethiopian eunuch, then the Roman centurion—these are examples of the way the Church learned that all who were drawn to Jesus were to be welcomed.

The third was an even more difficult lesson, the right attitude to truth itself. What was to be said of the religions around the early disciples? This, at any rate—that God had not left Himself anywhere without a witness, that the task of the Church was to announce what others worshipped in ignorance. They found Roman citizens looking to their emperor as God and Saviour, and they pointed them to the God and Saviour of all men. They saw many finding brotherhood and the hope of immortality in some mystery religion, and they pointed to the Sacrament of the Lord's Body and to the assurance of eternal life in the Risen Christ. They saw the nobler souls drawn to the Stoic teaching of dignity and self-mastery, and they pressed on them the deeper ethic of the Christian faith, hope and love.

All this was a part of the truth as it is in Jesus. But that word 'truth' has probably a deeper meaning. It suggests our word 'reality.' And this also we find in Jesus. What is Reality? A thing is real when it goes right home to the centre of our personality and proves itself true for us. Some incident of real love or sorrow lightens up words for us and shows them to us as God's words. That is what men felt about the words and actions of Jesus. They felt what a missionary in Central Africa says in a recent letter that he felt about the mountains there—that 'the Infinitely High seems the Infinitely Nigh.'

We see the sense of this developing in the Gospels. In St. Mark's Gospel the stress is laid on the Infinitely Nigh, God coming near to us in these deeds of love. St. Matthew and St. Luke both add a new thought to this. St. Matthew traces the truth which has become so nigh back along the line of Jewish history till it reaches infinitely far into the past. St. Luke's eye is turned mainly to the future, in which the Infinitely High will reach out to all mankind and satisfy its needs. An even greater step is taken by St. John. He has the thoughts of the other three, all of them, about the Christ. But there is a deeper realization of the Infinitely High. In the doctrine of the Logos, in the reach of the

picture of the Sonship, we see again that the supreme Reality has become embodied in the earthly life. This is part of the 'truth as it is in Jesus.'

The subject of the Fall of man has been well to the front in recent theological thought, and there is increasing evidence that it has begun to emerge from the long eclipse into which it was cast by the doctrine of evolution. The theory of an unbroken upward progress is felt to be inadequate to cover all the facts, and the optimism based on that theory has, especially since the war, been rudely shaken. A sense has grown upon us of a profound wrongness in things, and the time seems opportune for a re-statement of the Christian doctrine of the Fall.

An able attempt at such re-statement has been made by Mr. C. W. FORMBY, M.A., in *The Unveiling of the Fall* (Williams & Norgate; 10s. 6d. net). This book is written with considerable force, and, though somewhat marred by the over-confidence of the writer, it is a thought-provoking work which will repay the reader.

Accepting without reserve the scientific theory of organic evolution, the writer claims that its testimony throws a flood of new light upon the doctrine of the Fall.

This doctrine of the Fall, however, is a very different matter from the generally accepted evolutionary theory of the Fall, according to which 'the Fall represents the moral and spiritual breakdown of the will which happened to our original two human progenitors when their unfolding powers of moral sense were first called upon for a definite choice between right and wrong.' This theory is subjected to a detailed and acute criticism. It fails to explain 'the fallenness of man's original animalism and degradation,' it reflects on 'the justice and moral responsibility of God for the critical severity of the alleged test of immature man,' it offers no

rational explanation of the pre-human stage of evolution, especially in its pain and suffering. Here are criticisms which must be reckoned with.

When the writer comes to constructive work he is less convincing. He holds the theory of a pre-organic Fall, that is, a Fall in a spiritual realm which carried as its dire consequence the entrance of the life principle into the bonds of the flesh and the whole groaning and travailing together of creation until now.

Support for this theory is sought from the history of organic evolution, and also from certain statements of St. Paul as to the cosmical significance of Christ. In this high region the argument is naturally difficult to follow, and the writer seems to waver in his conceptions of the pre-mundane Adam. He rejects Origen's doctrine (following Plato) of a

'pre-mundane fall of single souls who carry into a penal corporeal life the effect of their pre-natal sin.' Yet he speaks of 'the unfallen being or beings whose vital units we now know in their highest expression as mankind.' Later he conceives of them as having had a corporate unity which was shattered by their Fall, and is destined to be restored in Christ.

The writer confidently believes that this presentation of the Fall will most powerfully convince the world of sin. It does indeed represent sin as a terrific cosmic force, but it is not easy to see how it can create a sense of personal guilt. We may conceivably have incurred responsibility for an Adam from whom we are descended by ordinary generation, but this pre-mundane Adam is not our kith and kin. As for the origin of evil, the insoluble mystery is still there, no matter how far back it be thrown.

The Servant of the Lord.

By STANLEY A. COOK, LITT.D., CAMBRIDGE.

I HAVE not seen the works of Mowinckel and Gunkel to which Professor McFadyen draws attention in *THE EXPOSITORY TIMES* (p. 294), but as my own view of the Servant approximates theirs, it may contribute to the much-needed reconsideration of the problem if I outline some of the points which have influenced me.¹

Admittedly Is 40-66 belongs to a period of anticipation and reconstruction, of expectation and new birth: the period which after far-reaching disturbances led to the inauguration of Post-Exilic Judaism. Between this period and that of the rise of Christianity there is a real psychological relationship; and the present age, whose issue is so obscure to us, is akin to both. Similar experiences and similar ages supplement and interpret each other, and there is much in the Bible which the intense years in which we now live should enable us to understand, perhaps more clearly than our

forefathers could. Of this the problem of the Servant is the most striking example.

Admittedly Deutero-Isaiah represents the high-water mark of Israel's spiritual religion. It was only passed some centuries later, when Judaism, instead of undergoing another rebirth or reconstruction, was unable to take a further step; and, instead of a new stage in the history and religion of a people, we have a new stage in man's religion and history. Whether our own period will witness a new stage in an old development, or the beginning of some entirely new development, future generations will be able to determine; but, in any event, we ourselves are well able to realize that to bring about any new decisive change in social-religious conditions more is needed than the possession of inspiring literature. In the lives of peoples, churches, and individuals, it is some tremendous spiritual experience that inaugurates a new stage, and sets in motion a fresh development; and when we seek to explain Israel's regeneration after the Exile, we are impelled to look for a spiritual revival,

¹ In one form or another they were set before the Society for Old Testament Study (July 21, 1921) and the Cambridge Theological Society (Oct. 27, 1921).

a distinctive religious personality, an outstanding spiritual genius.

As we peruse Is 40-66, we become conscious that the high hopes of the opening chapters are not realized; the new age is proving somewhat of a disappointment. 'We have passed from the brighter world of noble ideals and happy anticipation to the darker region of disillusionment' (Whitehouse, *Isaiah*, ii. p. 233). That there should be subsequent reaction, retrogression, or disappointment is in harmony with the fate of many a great reforming movement—one need refer only to the times of Ikhnaton (Amenhotep iv.) of Egypt and the Judæan king Josiah. But the supreme fact is that a new stage has been inaugurated, something has intervened; and Is 53 furnishes the clue. The Servant has come and gone; he was misunderstood, unrecognized, and despised. Men had awaited some one triumphant, but just as the Day of the Lord, so Amos declared, would not be in accordance with popular ideas, so the eagerly looked-for Servant of the Lord did not answer current anticipations.

Yet, as we ponder over that chapter, we realize that a new spiritual factor has been introduced. 'His chastisement brought *our* welfare, and *our* healing came through *his* stripes.' We have only to turn back and read Professor McFadyen's translation of the *Penitential Confession* (p. 296) to perceive that the burden of the past has been removed, a new era lies open. How readily we of to-day can appreciate the situation! The past behind our back, the dawn of a new future; all our mistakes left behind us, and before us the new social age of our aspirations!

Accordingly, Is 53 is a psychological turning-point in the history of Israel. We have always needed a conception of the Servant that would allow us to understand the interpretation of that chapter. Certainly, different ideas of the Servant prevailed in the age of Deutero-Isaiah—even in the Servant-passages themselves; but if we may recognize behind chap. 53 a figure, the 'fore-runner of Jesus'—to quote Gunkel's title,—the persistent Messianic interpretation finds a new justification. The age that was surpassed at the birth of Christianity produced a figure that was surpassed in the Founder of Christianity. It was a remarkable age. A Babylonian monarch set himself on an equality with the Most High (Is 14). The story of Nebuchadrezzar and Ezekiel's denunciation of the king of Tyre (ch. 28) also point in the same

direction. The day of prophets and Messiahs is also a day of false prophets and pseudo-Messiahs; and when ideas of God's Immanence are at their height, it is perilously easy to ignore God's Transcendence, and exalt the human above the divine.

A new consciousness, a new daring, can be recognized at this period, and it was a period of widespread religious ferment from Greece to China. We are not to be surprised, therefore, if the age of the Servant of the Lord was one of men of tremendous personality, varying in their worth, and as differently estimated by their contemporaries as the outstanding figures of intense reforming and revolutionary energy of our own age, whom even to name would land us in endless controversy. It is enough if behind Is 53 we may perceive a religious genius, a wonderful figure in a wonderful age, and as unknown as, *e.g.*, he who, amid wholly unknown conditions, gave birth to the lofty conception of the ethical god Varuna, who stands at the head of the entire historical development of Indian religion. That he should be unknown is no more surprising than the failure of Jewish history to name even the author (or authors) of Is 40-66, or to bridge the gulf between Zerubbabel and the Judaism of Ezra and Nehemiah. And, just as Ikhnaton's religious reform, in spite of every indication of failure, left its mark upon the old Egyptian religion, so we may believe that the very presence of Is 53 is due to men who saw in the despised Servant what others failed to see, and through him gained a new inspiration and a new vision. For a spiritual genius can be recognized only by men who possess some measure of his own spirituality.

There is an increasing readiness to recognize among ancient and even among lowly religions a spiritual and 'transcendent' element, which could be *relatively* as profound as that in higher religions. Sacrificial and other rites could evoke new ideas of the supernatural; outstanding 'sacred' men, and notably priestly rulers, could reshape men's conceptions of the relation between gods and men. Such men could be intermediaries: human representatives of the god, and representatives (in another sense) of their land and people, combining at once national, collective, and personal functions. There is a steady line of thought from the old sacred king to the Messiah, the Son of David, and the mysterious figure behind Is 53 occupies a logical position in the development of ancient thought.

In conclusion, the Old Testament may be said to turn upon the rebirth of Israel—upon the spirit which inaugurated the new historical development that goes down through the Persian and Greek ages to the Christian era. Isaiah 53 is therefore of fundamental importance for the religious interpretation of history and for the history of religion. It becomes ever more obvious that the vital questions of Christianity cannot be handled apart from the Old Testament, and that a reconsideration of the pro-

blem of the Servant of the Lord will contribute to contemporary Christological discussion. After all, the Bible as a whole has arisen out of the inner history of Palestine during a relatively small number of centuries, and these centuries are so organically interconnected, as regards the development of thought, that it would be contrary to all canons of research to draw an arbitrary line, as though the Old Testament and the New could be properly understood apart from each other.

Literature.

PAPINI'S LIFE OF CHRIST.

To write a new life of Christ is not too bold an enterprise in present conditions. We have had a great deal of preliminary work in the past generation, a great many books *pour servir*. We know more of the background, of the conditions of the time, of the language and everything else. And we are ready for a fresh treatment of the Supreme Story. *The Story of Christ*, by Giovanni Papini, translated by Mary P. Agnetti (Hodder & Stoughton; 10s. 6d. net), will not be accepted as the one we are looking for. Its main fault is one the present generation cannot overlook. But it is a really great book all the same, and one that no expositor of the Gospels can afford to neglect. It will be a gold mine to the preacher, for it is 'crawling' with sermons. And it will always have a place of its own, just because the writer is a man of genius and has looked at Jesus and read the Bible with his own eyes.

There is nothing ordinary about this book. Its merits (which are many) are extraordinary. Its main defect is quite extraordinary. As to its merits, probably the chief and the most valuable is the amazing imaginative power with which scenes are reconstructed. The scene in the Synagogue at Capernaum when Jesus preached there, with the members of the congregation described and the reasons for their presence; the story of the Prodigal Son (to which twelve pages are given), which reads as if it happened yesterday; the analysis of the way in which the Penitent Thief came to believe in Jesus—these are only a few out of many incidents which the reader feels to be *real*. This is how they must have happened. Of course it is imagination,

but it is imagination fed by study and based on actualities. And it makes the reading of these pages a continual pleasure. It makes you feel you are hearing the story of Jesus for the first time.

Not only so. What strikes one about this writer is that he has pierced to the heart of things, and thinks so independently that his representations are often strikingly original. His treatment of the Sinlessness of Jesus, *e.g.*, is quite his own and extraordinarily convincing. His picture of the three teachers of Jesus is very beautiful. But even more impressive is the exposition of the teaching of Jesus. There are fifty-three pages given to the Sermon on the Mount. It is not a conventional commentary, but no one will read it without feeling he has gained a fresh insight into the mind of Jesus, and more reason to love the Bible.

It would be difficult to praise these great qualities too highly. But there is a deduction. The writer is quite uncritical. His critical attitude is mediæval. Perhaps his history accounts for this. He passed from negation to a devout Romanism, and this is his standpoint in the book. The result is frequently such that one hesitates between distress and amusement. It makes his comments sometimes quaint and on occasion grotesque. A quaint example is his explanation of Jesus' baptism: 'Jesus was about to enter on a new period of His life, on His true life. By His immersion He attested His willingness to die, and at the same time the certainty of His resurrection.' That is a fair specimen of the writer's standpoint. But it is not a great defect, after all. Papini sets out to tell the greatest story in the world and he tells it greatly, in a fashion that will make it live for multitudes. We wish he

had a better critical understanding, but that is a very little matter in comparison with the great service he has rendered to the knowledge of Jesus.

The translation is so good that the book reads like an original.

THE ACHIEVEMENT OF ISRAEL.

What was the achievement of Israel? In a well-written and profoundly suggestive book, *The Achievement of Israel: A Study in Revelation Applied to Life* (James Clarke; 6s. net), the Rev. David Houston, M.A., defines it as her 'experiment in life and government inspired by religion.' No other nation ever made that experiment so thoroughly, and there is no experiment that the world more needs to make to-day. Here, as in all the difficult art of life, Israel is our teacher, and Mr. Houston skilfully marshals for us the lessons of her history by passing before us in intimate review the personalities and messages of her great prophets, from Abraham to Isaiah II. He has a real feeling for both historical and spiritual values, and his pages, though they cover familiar ground, bristle with subtle and illuminating things. Everywhere we are made to feel what a gain it was to the higher life of the world to have the prophetic criticism unceasingly directed upon the secular policy of the nation's rulers, and the analysis of Samuel and Elijah is particularly searching. The book, which is written with philosophic power and literary grace, is a really penetrating study of the inner meaning and the permanent value of Israel's history. It helps us to feel afresh the undying quality of the Old Testament, and in these days of confusion and collapse it is fitted to act as a tonic upon our bewildered hearts. 'Certain it is,' says Mr. Houston, 'that men in the thick of the fight for right and justice have rarely the feeling that God is to be defeated, even though for the moment they may be thrown back.' This book throws us back upon God and upon the great Hebrew interpreters of His ways.

It is a pleasure to note that it is dedicated to the memory of Dr. Hastings.

LANDMARKS IN FRENCH LITERATURE.

If any one wants to see how literary studies should be written, let him make haste to secure *Landmarks in French Literature*, by Mr. Lytton Strachey (Williams & Norgate; 7s. 6d. net). In some

respects this is the most satisfying book he has yet given us. Here are the old brilliance and sparkle, the now familiar enviable gift of style, the same fascination of an interesting mind unbosoming itself with frankness that gave Mr. Strachey his immediate success. But the tang of saltiness surely a shade too salt, the sarcasm that bit sometimes a trifle viciously, that chemical turn of mind that found an odd delight in coldly resolving things that looked very fair into their actual components and inviting us to note that some of them were none too pleasant and indeed really smelly, which irritated in the 'Eminent Victorians,' and lingered on, more delicate and subtle, much less obvious, yet still cruelly there, in 'Queen Victoria'—these things are gone (or do they flicker up one moment in the severe handling of Balzac?) and are replaced by something even cleverer and much more difficult—a sympathetic effort to look out through the eyes of these French writers one by one, to think oneself into their world, to understand not only what they were, but why they were just that. He never really knew the Eminent Victorians, because he disliked them; and without sympathy real understanding is impossible. Annoyed by a chorus of praise that seemed to him insensate, he rushed in as a devil's advocate and landed himself in a like exaggeration on the other side. But here he is among his friends; for from Villon to Pascal no one is alien to him. Mr. Strachey is indeed a devoted lover of French literature. He knows its every mood and adores them all. Those quick eyes of his are not blind to its faults, and his mind admits that they are faults, but his heart is quite satisfied that it should be just what it is. And what a vivid pen he has! To read his description of Froissart is like going into battle; how unforgettable is his picture of the days of Louis XIV.; how sane his defence of Racine against our British prejudices; how sure his tread amid the intricacies of the mind of a Voltaire or a Molière or a Rousseau—and always he leans to the charitable judgment now. And how much he can put into a phrase! Froissart is 'history seen through the eyes of a herald' (p. 16). Of Montaigne—'his book flows on like a prattling brook, winding through pleasant meadows' (p. 32). 'The importance of simplicity. This was Pascal's great discovery' (p. 49). 'In the Middle Ages La Fontaine would have been . . . a monk, surreptitiously illuminating the margins of his manuscripts with the images of birds and

beasts' (p. 99). 'Bossuët was too completely a man of his own epoch to speak with any great significance to after generations' (p. 107). 'La Rochefoucauld was an aristocrat . . . he has managed . . . to preserve all through it an air of slight disdain' (p. 111). Of La Bruyère, 'one feels as one reads that this is an impartial judge' (p. 116). Of Saint Simon's portraits, 'he never forgot, in the extremity of his ferocity, to commit the last insult, and to breathe into their nostrils the fatal breath of life' (p. 137). Of Voltaire's style, 'the pointed, cutting, mocking sentences laugh and dance through his pages like light-toed, prick-eared elves. Once seen, and there is no help for it—one must follow' (p. 157). 'It is a safe rule to make, that Voltaire's meaning is deep in proportion to the lightness of his writing' (p. 164). 'Voltaire's style is narrow; it is like a rapier—all point' (p. 165). And so on indefinitely.

This book comes as a relief. 'Books and Characters' gave the somewhat melancholy impression of drawers being ransacked for old and immature manuscripts. It now seems rather to have been a moulting season, from which Mr. Strachey has emerged more vivid than before, bereft of his sting, but even more dazzlingly coloured.

PROPHECY.

In *Prophecy and the Prophets in Ancient Israel* (Duckworth; 5s. net), Professor T. H. Robinson tells in a most vivid and effective way the fascinating story of the rise, progress, and decline of Hebrew prophecy. Except the story of Jesus Himself, perhaps no story is better worth telling. For the prophetic movement in Israel was beyond all comparison the greatest spiritual achievement of the pre-Christian world, and the rediscovery of the true interpretation and significance of that movement was unquestionably one of the greatest intellectual achievements of the nineteenth century.

Dr. Robinson begins by showing that only upon Hebrew soil could the way for Jesus have been prepared. Then, after discussing the two religions of Israel—the purer nomadic form of Yahweh-worship, represented in the main by the south and the east, and the agricultural type prevalent in the north and deeply infected by Canaanitish Baalism—he proceeds to deal, in a highly interesting fashion, with the early ecstatic prophets, throwing out the important suggestion that ecstasy, which 'does

not seem to have been a part of the common heritage of the Semitic race,' was possibly of Hittite origin. Then he passes before us in succession the personalities, messages, and methods of the prophets, major and minor, making us feel that ecstasy played a larger part throughout than we are apt to imagine, and dropping incidentally the useful reminder that part of the greatness of the great Servant (or Slave, as he calls him) of Yahweh in the famous Songs is that he rose above the ecstatic and spectacular and did his prophetic work in quiet and unobtrusive ways. The story is then carried on to the period of eschatological prophecy, which is, in some aspects, a reversion to an earlier type.

Prophecy abounds in unsolved problems, and Professor Robinson has contributed perhaps as much as any man in the English-speaking world towards the solution of some of them. He has made it highly probable that ecstasy played a large part in the demeanour, not only of the so-called 'false' prophets, but even of the canonical prophets, of men like Amos and Jeremiah. 'Thus saith Yahweh' should more properly be rendered 'Thus said Yahweh,' and the brief oracle that follows is strictly the recollection of the oracle delivered in ecstatic mood. Second sight and second hearing were, generally speaking, characteristic of the prophets, and both are illustrated in the great vision of Isaiah. The consequences of this view are obviously profound, one of them being that the prophetic messages are briefer and more fragmentary, and the collections represented by the books are ultimately more disconnected, than many have been in the habit of believing.

The book reads very smoothly. There is no parade of learning, but everywhere we feel the skilful guidance of one who knows all the ground, and has traversed it repeatedly and independently. Dr. Robinson is not afraid to go his own way, and his discussion is full, not only of good things, but of fresh things. He is not afraid to suggest, for example, that Hosea was a man of the city, perhaps a baker by trade. In opposition to many modern scholars he believes that the attitude of the pre-Exilic prophets to sacrifice might have been different had the ritual been purer than it was, and he believes that the Servant of Yahweh's songs, which he regards as possibly not coming from the pen of Deutero-Isaiah, are not to be interpreted individually, but as embodying 'the character of the ideal slave of Yahweh.'

The book is a really fresh discussion of a well-worn theme, stimulating alike to mind and heart. Appended is a valuable Bibliography on Prophecy by Professor Peake.

THE DOMINANT SEX.

The present century has been characterized by gradual but marked advance towards the equality of women and men in the spheres both of public law and public life, not only throughout the British Empire and the United States of America, but in other countries. There are signs of change even in Muhammadan States and in far eastern lands like China and Japan. There have been many stages, but a steady progress towards free entrance into every avenue of daily labour, though the final goal is not yet won.

But there is nothing new under the sun. Civilization is not a thing of yesterday and to-day. It is ages old, and in other times and among other races—e.g., the people of Egypt and the times of Tutankh-amen just brought before us so vividly—there were other manners and customs. One has only to read the records of the most primitive and the most civilized peoples alike, as they are to be found in the pages of such a comprehensive work as the *ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS*, to realize that both have their lessons for us. ‘When Adam delved and Eve span, who was then the gentleman?’ is the question that Socialism is asking to-day. We have now another question in a volume just published entitled *The Dominant Sex: A Study in the Sociology of Sex Differentiation* (Allen & Unwin; 10s. 6d. net). This is the translation by Eden and Cedar Paul of a German work by Mathilde and Mathias Vaerting. We are told that this is a pioneer work in its endeavour to prove that there have been States in the world’s history in which women have been as dominant in the control of family and of public affairs as men are to-day. In both States it is the women’s function, of course, to bear children, but in the Women’s State it is the men who nurse and rear the children and take upon them all the drudgery of domestic work. We do not know if in the Women’s State there was ever any difficulty in getting male domestic servants as in the Men’s State of to-day there is a scarcity of women domestics. ‘We may assume,’ say the authors of this book, ‘that the upper-class men of the Women’s State must have

led a life no less slothful than that with which we ourselves are so familiar in the case of the upper-class women of the Men’s State. Among the well-to-do, even to-day, the men have, as a rule, some active occupation away from home, whereas their womenkind lead a life of absolute inertia, not even doing any housework. . . . A foreign visitor to a Women’s State would derive the converse impression and would think that the women worked while the men lazed.’ ‘The women of the Women’s State,’ they say, ‘have very different physical aptitudes from those possessed by the women of the contemporary Men’s State. Where woman rules she is no less superior to man in bodily capacity than man is superior to woman in this respect where man holds sway. It is home work, in especial, that impairs bodily fitness. . . . As women acquire equal rights their physical fitness increases. . . . We have, therefore, adequate grounds for the opinion that women’s physique has had nothing to do, as cause, with the division of labour between the sexes.’

It is impossible to follow the authors into their history of the dominance of women in ancient Egypt and parts of Greece and among many Indian primitive peoples. This investigation has been a prolonged and careful one, embracing many different phases of the subject. The results, such as they are, seem to point to the conclusion that a civilization which offers equality of opportunity to both sexes will work out the greatest good for the greatest number.

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS TO-DAY.

In spite of all that has been written and spoken about the League of Nations, it is doubtful how far public opinion is well informed on the subject. An admirable handbook has now been published which deserves to be widely read. Its title is *The League of Nations To-day*, by Roth Williams (Allen & Unwin; 6s. net). The book has a threefold aim, to describe the structure and working of the League, to give an account of its main achievements, and to indicate how Britain should use the League for the resettlement of Europe and the world. The writer is an enthusiastic believer in the League as the best instrument for the reconstruction of Europe and the surest bulwark of the peace of the world, and it may be heartily admitted that he makes a good case.

The League of Nations has sometimes been belittled as if it were merely a philanthropic associa-

tion like the Save the Children Fund ; sometimes it has been abused as if it were an omnipotent super-state, able, if it chose, to deal effectively with all international questions. Its true constitution and powers are here carefully set down, so that one may see both what it can and what it cannot do. Already the League has a creditable record of good work done. The settlement of the Aaland Islands, the repatriation of war prisoners, the service rendered by its health organization, its regulations in regard to opium and the traffic in women and children, are work of the sort that appeals to the heart of humanity. When the writer comes to deal with the League in relation to British foreign policy he plunges into the burning questions of the day—the Ruhr, the recognition of Russia, the attitude of the United States, etc. In this region he will not expect his views to meet with universal acceptance, but he shows sound judgment and thorough competence in handling these difficult problems. Britain's policy is in various respects criticised, yet after all her record in connexion with the League of Nations is comparatively not so bad. 'The League was our chief aim in the war, and both during and after the Peace Conference the British Government, bad as its record is in the light of any but the most modest standards, has done relatively better than any other government—has proved less niggardly in financing League activities, less unready to refer questions to the League for settlement, and less dilatory in carrying out League decisions. Public opinion in England, too, has been less ignorant and apathetic about the League than in any other country. . . . Finally, there is no parallel elsewhere to the way all parties at the last general election pledged themselves up to the hilt to the League, and many candidates made the League one of their main planks.' -

OUT-OF-DATE AMERICA.

A wave of old-fashioned orthodoxy, quite curiously obscurantist, gathered in 1921, and has been sweeping across the United States ever since. Matters that with us were settled centuries ago are being questioned yonder with a passionate vehemence and by arguments that are mediæval. 'In the City of Zion (Illinois) the school children are compelled by theological authority, expressed through the civil government, to learn that the earth is flat "like a pie, surrounded by a circle of

water, inclosed by an outer circle of impenetrable ice!"' In Kentucky a teacher was dismissed for teaching that the earth is round ; and a court of law supported the school board in this action, on the ground that such teaching is contrary to the plain statement of Scripture, and therefore to fact. A Congress of seven hundred delegates from twenty-six States seems to have agreed to withhold all financial support from those guilty of the heresy of evolution ! And big men are in it. Is not Mr. William Jennings Bryan one of the most pronounced and energetic critics of an evolutionary origin of man, and that on the most narrow dogmatic grounds ? Even the theological colleges, or some of them, are disturbed by the clamour. Thus Mr. H. H. Lane, the Professor of Zoology in Kansas University, was asked by the theological students at one college to tell them 'what is the theory of evolution, and what are the important facts on which it is based ; and what effect the acceptance of that theory has upon one's views of the Biblical account of creation and of the Christian Religion.'

It is astonishing that there is a part of the intelligent world still at that stage ! Yet these students, if slow in making up their minds on some things, are shrewd fellows. For they chose a wholly admirable guide ; and he has written a queerly belated but wholly admirable book—*Evolution and Christian Faith* (Milford ; 9s. net). Here is the full knowledge of an expert joined to a gift of writing interestingly, with no dull pages.

And yet, highly to be commended though it is, it is not so fascinating as the problem that lies behind it—Why is America, that prides itself upon its go-aheadness, in some respects the limping laggard of the world ?

When that doughty fighter, Mr. G. Lowes Dickinson, espouses any cause he does so with his whole being, throwing in everything he has, and striking to kill. So it is in his latest book—*War: Its Nature, Cause, and Cure* (Allen & Unwin ; 4s. 6d. net). He has a great purpose, and he flings himself into it with a shuddering horror of all war, and a terror of the chemical devilries which he sees with truth will certainly mark the next, unless men's minds can be weaned from the whole imbecility in time. Here is all the rush and passion of pleading of a

man deeply moved and utterly in earnest. And one wishes him God-speed. But the book is less convincing than it might have been. Had it been more quietly written it would have been likelier to impress those to whom it is addressed; and, even more, if Mr. Dickinson had not ventured on history, giving with assurance a detailed reading of the last twenty years or so. And history, thank God, is not his strong point. For, accept this account, and there were nothing for it but to conclude that this world is a mere gibbering madhouse, and humanity a dupe so silly and so sordid that it almost deserves to be fooled. It is a really dreadful earth that Mr. Dickinson sees: but, happily, the value of his reading of things can be gauged by the one gleam of unconscious humour in a wholly solemn book, 'America, and America alone, was disinterested. She was not proposing to get anything out of the war.'

There is a marked contrast between Professor Peet's book, which was reviewed last month, and *The Oldest Letters in the World tell us—What?* by Mrs. Sydney Bristowe (Allen & Unwin; 5s. net). 'My firm belief,' 'my conviction,' 'my contention,' are favourite expressions in the latter. Written in a 'frankly controversial' spirit, it clashes with the findings of recognized authorities at every point. We can appreciate the author's position by this statement of creed: 'Believing that, in the Apostle Paul's words, "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God," I take the Bible as my key to ancient history.' Her thesis may be said to be 'the Tel-el-Amarna tablets elucidated by the Bible.' In this consists the true witness, whereas the false witness of the pagan priests of Amenhotep's and Dusratta's countries is unmasked in the Tablets. Startling theories are propounded, and startling equations are reached. The Haberi are the Israelites who, under the leadership of Joshua (Canaanite name: Abdasherah), conquered Palestine and Phœnicia, including Tyre and Sidon. The Phœnicians are Israelites, and their descendants are now to be found in Britain (another link having been added to the chain of evidence). The Canaanites, the 'accursed race', are accorded no place, and in the same way the 'Great Hittite Empire'—'in the light of Bible prophecy impossible'—disappears. 'Subbiluliuma did not exist at all.' The name is but a variant of Dusratta of Mitanni, who is also to be identified with Tarkhundarush. Just as

certain Biblical figures (e.g. Joshua, Adonibezek) suddenly emerge in well-known Tablet personages, so other figures, even kingly, are called in question: 'Can we believe, for instance, in the existence of the three kings called respectively, Sakere, Tut-enkhamen and Eye, who are believed to have reigned in succession after Amenhotep the fourth, but whose united reigns only lasted, according to Professor Breasted about eight years and whose names do not inspire confidence.'

This sentence is reproduced as it stands, to show how defective is the punctuation of the book.

'The contemporary priests . . . have successfully befogged ancient history.' The arguments of the book aim at convincing readers of this; 'let them tell me where they think me wrong' (part of motto [Samuel Johnson], preceding Chapter I.).

No index is provided.

What is to be done with the adolescent who escapes from school imperfectly educated and is not absorbed into steady employment? He often drifts into unskilled work with good money, but it is a dead end, and he is left at sixteen or seventeen without a trade and with the habit of steady learning gone out of his head. The Day Continuation School was set up to solve this problem, and its object is both to develop the adolescent himself, body and mind, and to train him into a good citizen and efficient worker. How it is doing this, how it may do it better, what is wanted to make these schools more efficient, and how other nations are facing the problem—all this is dealt with in *The Day Continuation School in England*, by Edith Anna Waterfall (Allen & Unwin; 7s. 6d. net). It is a thorough and able piece of work, engrossing in its interest, and dealing in a competent fashion with a problem which is vital for the welfare of the nation and the world.

It is often suggested that the present is not a religious age. We do not go to church as our fathers did, it is said. We have cast off many of our fathers' beliefs. And so on. Most of this is untrue or exaggerated. At any rate, it cannot be denied that this is an inquiring age, deeply interested in problems of faith and wistfully seeking assurance. A significant indication of this is the fact that the *Times* newspaper publishes every Saturday an article on some topic of moral or religious interest.

A selection of these articles has been made by Sir James Marchant, K.B.E., LL.D., and published under the title *Life's True Values* (Allenson; 5s. net), and they are well worth permanent preservation. Every side of life and truth is presented here with a freshness of treatment and a fertility and originality that make the reading of them a delight. The topic is suggested by the passing occasion—a day in the Church Year, the holiday season, the New Year, or any other event. And the anonymous writers have always something suggestive and inspiring to say; the standpoint is frankly Christian, and though theology in the technical sense is avoided there is always a robust faith in the background.

One great lesson religious teachers may learn from this book. The deepest themes are always discussed in plain language. And the lesson is needed, for the most frequent and most deserved criticism of the pulpit to-day is that preachers use language which is not familiar to their hearers. There is, on the other hand, something home-coming in the 'secular' style of these essays. They might well be taken in this respect as a model.

If Nature's treasure-house were not inexhaustible, it could not provide material for the innumerable talks and parables which are poured out for the instruction and delight of the children of to-day. *A Garden of Beautiful Stories*, by William J. May (Allenson; 5s. net), contains thirty-six nature parables and stories written with true insight into the heart of a child. The writer has the dramatic instinct and the real story-teller's gift. His work is touched with fine imagination and sympathy. Children will be captivated by these delightful parables, and teachers will find them full of suggestion.

Mr. Bryan has raised 'some' storm in America by his crusade against Darwinism. Doubtless good will come out of it, for 'the controversy which he provoked sent multitudes of inquirers to the libraries and book stores who had probably never before read anything of a serious nature on evolution.' Hay Watson Smith, Pastor of Second Presbyterian Church, Little Rock, Arkansas, has published a big pamphlet, *Evolution and Presbyterianism* (Allsopp & Chapple), to instruct his people in the question at issue. His method is to quote at great length opinions of distinguished Scots Presbyterians favourable to evolution. 'Why no American

Presbyterians? The answer is that, for the purposes of this pamphlet, there are none to quote—none that are at all representative.' The curious *a fortiori* conclusion is drawn, 'If representative Presbyterian ministers find nothing in evolution that is incompatible with Presbyterianism, nothing will be found in it that is inconsistent with Christianity—a very much simpler thing!' To us the pamphlet is significant for the sidelight it throws on American theological thought.

Within the compass of eighty short pages the Rev. T. W. Crafer, D.D., tells in clear and simple language all that the ordinary reader needs to know about the difficult but highly important *Book of Hosea*; Revised Version for Schools (Cambridge University Press; 2s.). The writer has made good use of Sir George Adam Smith and Melville Scott's 'Message of Hosea.' The introduction deals with the historical background and the prophet's message, and the commentary is adequate. Dr. Crafer believes broadly in the integrity of the book, and therefore, unlike some recent critics, regards the hopeful passages as integral to the message of Hosea.

If publishers would only believe it, the blowing of trumpets on the wrapper of a book is a mistake! Frankly we were prejudiced against *God's Freeman*, by Professor N. Micklem, M.A. (James Clarke; 5s. net). But we were wrong. It is a fine healthy book that acts like a tonic. In the beginning it is somewhat after the style of 'Men of the Covenant.' Not that it is anything like as good. But then Dr. Smellie was almost a genius, and very certainly was a real stylist. Professor Micklem, too, can write, and he takes us through a picture gallery of spiritual heroes, somewhat oddly chosen. And then, gathering his force together, and looking out on the world of our own day with kind and fearless eyes, he urges us to prove our Protestantism, as those men did before us, by facing wrongs, and overthrowing sham, and exercising our liberty. This is a rapid, vivid, healthy book.

The Rev. F. W. Aveling, M.A., B.Sc., minister of the Congregational Church at St. Neots, has written an account of his own Christian beliefs which will be read with interest and respect. It bears the brief title *Credo* (James Clarke; 5s. net). The author rightly holds that there is a keen demand to-day

or positive statements on truth, and he endeavours to meet this demand by a frank discussion of fundamental problems. The Existence of God, the Incarnation, the Atonement, Miracles, Immortality, Pain, and Future Punishment are the subjects of successive chapters which are all alike characterized by independent and fearless writing. The standpoint is a moderate and enlightened orthodoxy, but the author has his own thoughts, and these are not always conventional. There is a sincerity and earnestness in the treatment of difficult questions that will impress and captivate the inquiring mind, and these contributions to a reasonable Christian apologetic will help to establish and enlighten doubting spirits.

The Pulpit and the Children (James Clarke; 6s. 6d. net) contains seventy-two very brief addresses to the young by the Rev. Robert Hill, M.A., of Renfrew. Mr. Hill was a fellow-student with Principal Sir George Adam Smith, who in a foreword to these addresses writes: 'They have confirmed what I have always felt about Mr. Hill, that he has preserved the simplicity and freshness of his youth better than any of his contemporaries.' Mr. Hill does not attempt to elaborate his text. He is content to illustrate it by brief but pointed stories. His purpose is to suggest what others—preachers and teachers and parents—may elaborate in their own way.

The subject of Autosuggestion is interesting on its psychological side, but it is even more interesting on its practical side as a method of healing. This practical side is expounded fully and in a most interesting fashion in a new book with the title *Self-Healing by Autosuggestion*, by M. A. Dolonne Dent; 3s. 6d. net). The exposition is clear and simple. First of all the writer explains the nature of autosuggestion, then he discusses the elements of which it is composed, and finally he describes the conditions requisite for its fruitful practice. Great claims are made for the method, and stories of healing are told to substantiate the claims. M. Dolonne devotes many pages to explaining the influence of the mind on the body, and bases the new method on this acknowledged fact. It will be enough to say that the book is a plain, straightforward account of M. Coué's theory and practice, and that any one wishing to know 'how it is done' will find it all expounded here.

The Creed in the Papal Mass, by C. E. Roney-Dougal, Esq., M.A. (Dyte, Bath; 3d.), is a pamphlet on the creeds. The author is dissatisfied with the Papal form, and gives his reasons with some minuteness. There is also a curiously old-fashioned dedication to Lord Birkenhead.

Thy Love and Thy Grace, by Cuthbert Lattey, S.J. (Herder; 6s. net), is an eight days' retreat. It is intended specifically for those bound by the three vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience. But it is hoped that priests generally, and even the devout laity, may find the book helpful. This is likely to be the case. Much ground is reverently covered; and our minds are concentrated on the deepest and most central things. And if to Protestants some things here and there feel far away, they must still wish that this earnest work of a devout mind may have every success.

In England and Scotland alike the dominant subject of interest at present in Church life is the prospect of union. In Scotland the prospect is entirely favourable, for between the two great Presbyterian Churches there remains no obstacle that involves principle. In England the difficulties might appear nearly insurmountable. But even there 'it moves.' The Lambeth Appeal created a new situation, and the Joint Committee of Representatives from the various Churches have found some common ground. In order to explore this more fully a series of meetings was held in London at which prominent men from these Churches expounded the point of view they represented, and these discussions have now been published under the title *The Lambeth Joint Report on Church Unity: A Discussion* (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d. net). The aim was to help in the creation of a 'common mind' out of which greater things may come. The contributors are the Archbishop of York, Dr. W. B. Selbie, Dr. Scott Lidgett, Dr. Carnegie Simpson, and Bishop Headlam. The essays are most interesting and valuable, and the frank and generous expression of varied standpoints is certain to advance the great cause which all the writers have at heart.

The Creed for the Twentieth Century, by C. G. Harrison (Longmans; 4s. 6d. net), is the work of a convinced, not to say bigoted, high churchman. The aim of the author is 'the correction of a false, though widely prevalent, impression, that the

advance of knowledge, and especially discoveries in the realms of physical science within the last hundred years, have made it impossible for intelligent persons to hold in the twentieth century beliefs about God and His relation to the phenomenal Universe which satisfied our simple forefathers.' This is excellent, and the work might have been so done as to earn the gratitude of all Christians. But at the outset the reader is met with the blunt assertion that the divine purpose is carried out by a society 'the Catholic Church, represented in this country by the Church of England. This society is easily recognized by certain marks distinguishing it from all other *soi-disant* Christian bodies.'

The author's reading of Church history can hardly lay claim to scientific accuracy. 'For a thousand years the Church of the Kingdom of God was undivided. This was the first Millennium or reign of Christ on earth.' Economic conditions in the Middle Ages are represented as having been almost ideal. But 'with the Reformation, which was conceived in lust and born of oppression, all this came to an end. . . . After a false dawn in the reign of Charles I. under Laud, this country became wholly delivered over to idolatry.' The fate reserved for Protestantism is to 'wither and die of its own inherent absurdity,' though on another page the extraordinary suggestion is made that 'there is reason to think that Protestantism will sooner or later make common cause with Mohammedanism and modern Judaism.'

From a mind which views Christian history in this wise little is to be hoped in the way of a persuasive presentation of the articles of the creed. Never once does the writer succeed in coming into sympathetic touch with the modern mind. From the summit of his high tower of orthodoxy he looks out upon an unbelieving world and sternly sounds the trumpet of recall. Difficulties he handles with but thinly veiled impatience. Regarding the Resurrection 'it is difficult to understand how it can be reasonably denied, or even doubted, except on *a priori* grounds, which, whatever weight they may have carried a generation ago, do not commend themselves to the more enlightened reason of the twentieth century. No one doubts that Charles I. was beheaded at Whitehall on January 30, 1649, and the evidence for the Resurrection is at least as good.' Is the matter really so simple?

It is hard to imagine any educated mind being impressed by work of this sort, and the reader is

left with a dreary sense of the ponderous obstacles which dogmatic churchism continues to pile up, not merely in the path of Christian reunion, but in the way of faith itself.

God with Us, by E. J. Bodington (Longmans; 2s. net), is a series of short studies in divine immanence. Having been originally delivered as lectures to the London Girls' Diocesan Association, they are simple and lucid, yet well informed and deeply thoughtful. The method of the book is historical, and it throbs with a passion for Christ. One may be dubious of some of the opinions expressed, as when it is said, 'there are some people who, it seems, are unable to be religiously converted. If people have not the religious faculty, they must try to be good all the same.' Or again, 'Men and women will crowd into the Church as soon as ever they believe that Christ's own principles are taught and acted upon.' The writer, with pleasing modesty, doubts whether these lectures are worthy of publication; let him be assured that his little book has more sap and marrow in it than many a more imposing volume.

A Liturgy was issued in 1920 for use in the Indian Church. It was compiled by private persons as an experiment, and was entitled 'The Eucharist in India.' A general approval was given to this form by a committee of the Lambeth Conference along with certain suggestions of improvements. These were supplemented by further contributions from friends, and the result has been a revision of the original form, which is now issued in a beautifully printed pamphlet with the title *An Order for the Administration of the Holy Communion* (Longmans; 2s. 6d. net). This revised liturgy has been tentatively sanctioned by the Episcopal Synod of India for experimental use in the diocese of Bombay, and experience will determine its value and place in the permanent worship of the Church in India.

Pulling Together, by John T. Broderick (Robson & Adey, U.S.A.; \$2), which has gone through several editions since its publication a year ago, has now been reprinted with a sequel. It is a most pleasant and readable account of the experiences of a big firm in the Middle West which has introduced employee representation into its management with the happiest results. The failure of autocracy, whether on the part of Employer or of Trades Union, is demonstrated, and misunderstandings are

known to be due largely to lack of mutual knowledge. With the coming together of directors and employees in friendly conference a new and sweeter atmosphere was generated, production was increased, and economies effected, while wages and profits advanced together in happy union. The principle is emphasized that 'production is essentially an orderly, peaceful process—one in which normally there is no place for disputes. . . . We are positively ashamed of disputes, as a decent man is of a family row.' The underlying ideal is a frankly Christian. 'The most practical business concepts there are were enunciated two thousand years ago, and the needful things of life would be much more abundant for all classes than they now are if the Prince of Peace, with His sane and simple program of mutual service, were also accepted universally as the Prince of Industry.'

The writer of *The Exodus in the Light of Archaeology*, Mr. J. S. Griffiths (Robert Scott; 2s. 6d. net), has made out a very good case from the conservative standpoint, and his book deserves to be read. That he will not win universal assent to his solution of the problem goes without saying. If his verdict is taken in conjunction with Professor Peet's on 'Egypt and the Old Testament'), a good idea will be conveyed of the opposite beliefs current in the question of the date of the Exodus. In view of this disagreement the average reader must still reserve an open mind.

The author admits the need for textual criticism, the discrepancies and difficulties of the text of the Old Testament, and the possibility that a whole section (Nu 10¹¹⁻²¹¹³) is out of place. He rejects the documentary theory, and attaches himself to the Library theory of H. M. Wiener, whom he follows throughout.

The thesis of the book, 'Is it possible to determine the precise date of the Exodus?' is answered thus: 'The second year of Meneptah (1233-2 B.C., Petrie's dating) will fit all the facts, and it is the only one that will do so.' The Conclusion states: 'Our task is done. The problem has been solved.'

There is an additional note (p. 79) on Dr. Garinier's articles, called 'A,' on p. 45. Additional notes 'B' and 'C' are also referred to, but they have not been found.

Take with you Words, by Rev. S. J. Rowton (Skeffingtons; 2s. 6d. net), is intended primarily

as a manual for the use of ordination candidates, but it should prove extremely helpful to all preachers and public readers of Scripture. It deals with matters of pronunciation, phrasing, emphasis, and the like. It contains numerous examples of the errors into which the careless or unwary reader is apt to fall. Interesting light is thrown on many texts, though it is not to be expected that the writer's judgment will be always followed. Probably few would accept the reading of I AM THAT I AM as being analogous to 'Art thou that Moses,' and as bearing the meaning of 'I am that well known I AM.'

But it is an admirable little book, packed full of sound advice. Take this on preaching: 'To a man who is going to take a service in Church the first piece of advice to be given is that he should be perfectly natural—should speak as at other times, without the slightest strain on the organs of utterance. It is a good working rule that whatever vocal tone is produced easily is produced rightly, whereas any noticeable effort shows that there is something wrong. All affectation, every kind of mannerism, must be severely repressed. . . . It is only by misusing it in some way that speakers get what is called the parson's sore throat.'

In *Grasps of Guess*, by Mr. Gerald H. Paulet, B.A. (Skeffingtons; 2s. 6d. net), we have another effort to help the ordinary man who is not satisfied with the ancient creeds of the Church as they stand to think his own way to belief with the aid of his personal experience. The position is perhaps indicated best by a quotation: 'The Church is not a land-locked harbour wherein the soul may rest at careless ease, without effort of thought or desire of discovery; but rather it is a wide, strong-built shelter, thrusting out to the open, wherein the little bark may steal for safe anchorage, only on the condition, however, that she prove sea-worthy and ready to face the dangers of the deep.'

Taking the creeds as a working hypothesis the author invites us to launch out, not only into speculative thought, but also into deep personal Christian experience. The old problems of Divine Intervention, Free-will, The Inspiration of the Bible, The Trinity, Eternal Punishment, Immortality, etc., are dealt with in the form of letters to a friend. Technical terms of theology and philosophy are generally avoided or popularly defined, and whether one agrees with the conclusions or not there is

always something to stimulate thought. Moreover, in all the letters one is made to feel that he is getting the fruits of the author's own deep experience, resulting in the conviction, often repeated, that the solution of all these problems is to be found in a fuller personal realization of the infinite love of God in Jesus Christ.

Dr. Percy Dearmer must be a delightful person. Here is the second volume of his *Lessons on the Way* (S.P.C.K.; 3s. 6d. net) to prove it once again. Reynolds once wrote that a painting should not only be well done, but it should seem to have been done easily. And here is that difficult art, speaking to young folk, carried through with such success that there seems to be no difficulty about it—till one tries again for oneself! It is true that Dr. Dearmer does not talk to the young directly, but through their teachers. But that is even harder, as anybody will admit. One great recommendation is that he goes straight to the central things. The temptation is, of course, to stay on the circumference. It is so much easier to talk about aeroplanes or beetles, with some more or less apt application to things spiritual towards the close. But Dr. Dearmer boldly speaks for a whole year about the Creed, shirks nothing, and does it so interestingly that it will be an odd boy who, listening, has any dull moments. He has a mass of new and apt illustrations, used with judgment. But what gives the book its success is two things—his knowledge of the great truths he is teaching, and the young mind he is addressing—that and his own personality, with its breeziness and its humour and its downright directness. He is not afraid to go far. 'It is so important to understand the jolly doctrine of God's Fatherhood.' But let nobody mistake! The characteristic of the book is its author's reverence for God, and those he teaches ought to catch the infection of that.

Visitors to museums would be well advised to prepare themselves 'for seeing Egyptian things intelligently' by aid of Mrs. A. A. Quibell's *Egyptian History and Art* (S.P.C.K.; 6s. net). This is a work of outstanding merit, whose usefulness has been already tested (for Cairo Museum), produced by one who has carefully equipped herself by residence at the very centre of things, and who is thoroughly conversant with the contents of museums the whole world over. The volume is far from

being of the ordinary catalogue order. It is a continuous narrative of Egyptian history, with special reference to art, from earliest times down to the Arab conquest (3600 B.C.—A.D. 642), presented in a form readily intelligible to all, and at the same time marked by the enthusiasm of the expert. Sound judgment characterizes the whole book, and on debatable points—e.g. the date of the Exodus—praiseworthy restraint is exercised. 'There are difficulties about both theories' [earlier and later dating], she says, 'and though we may lean to one rather than to the other, it is better to admit that the question can hardly be answered satisfactorily on the facts as they are known at present.'

The up-to-date character of the book is apparent in the passages (Preface, etc.) bearing on the Tut-ankh-amen find. Judging from the summary here given we may look to Mrs. Quibell to do full justice to this theme when opportunity arises. Enough is said to show that she adequately realizes the artistic merit of the furniture discovered. 'The historical importance of the discovery is probably not very great, but it is rather too soon to affirm anything positively about this.'

These are but two items selected from a volume brimful of interest throughout. The illustrations in the text are excellent and are clearly explained. Fifteen photographic plates appended enhance the value of the book.

The Desire of All Nations, by W. H. Seddon (Elliot Stock; 5s. net), has for its sub-title 'Christ and Reconstruction.' This opens a very wide field. The author's method is historical, and he shows competent scholarship throughout. He deals with the person and work of Christ in relation to the Kingdom of God, and briefly outlines the development of the Kingdom. His spirit, though dispassionate, is firmly Protestant and democratic. Rome is the heir of ancient pagan imperialism, and the hope of the nations lies in a world-wide democracy owning allegiance to Christ. And if a 'Mora Metropolis' is needed, 'neither Geneva, nor the Hague, nor any other European city is ideally suited for the purpose; for the new Unity must be larger than Europe. It must embrace the New World as well as the Old, and must extend from East to West. There is no city in the world which possesses the cosmopolitan sanctity and prestige of Jerusalem; and it bears already the ideal title of "The City of Peace."'

The deepest and most urgent question of the seeking soul is: 'How can I be sure of God?' and this question Principal W. J. Moulton, M.A., B.D., of Didsbury College, Manchester, sets out to answer in an admirable little book, published by the Student Christian Movement—*The Certainty of God* (3s. 6d. net). Its central contention is that 'when all possible allowance has been made for what we have gained from our education, from the society in which we live, and from our inherited beliefs, we are brought, in the last resort, face to face with a living God, and that throughout our lives we may receive:

Authentic tidings of invisible things.'

In nine chapters of close but clear argument he proceeds step by step to make good his contention, dealing with the fact of Christ, Christ and History, Sin as a reality, the Meaning of the Cross, Conversion, and the Social Consequences of Salvation. The whole treatment is extraordinarily good, and we cannot think of any book better suited to its purpose

of presenting the case for the Christian religion to a young and inquiring mind.

An admirable review of the work done by the World's Student Christian Federation during the past year is published under the title *Under Heaven One Family* (World's Student Christian Federation; 6d.). The Federation has a membership of over a quarter of a million present students, and the British Student Movement is only one of many bodies included in it. The present report records faithfully the aims of the Federation, emphasizing its definitely Christian character, and reveals the wide and statesmanlike scope of its efforts. There is an interesting section on the Peking Conference, whose watchword gives the title to this report, and special stress is laid on the international aspect of the Federation's operations. The review might be summarized in the phrase which dominated the Peking meetings: 'Jesus Christ and World Reconstruction.' Copies of this report may be obtained from the Student Christian Movement Bookroom, London.

The Breaking-Point.

BY THE REVEREND JOHN A. HUTTON, D.D., LONDON.

'If I say, I will speak thus; behold, I should offend against the generation of thy children.'—Ps 73¹⁸.

You always find the conclusion of a psalm at the beginning. You always find the last word, the result of all the travail, at the very outset. You only need to think for a moment of how a psalm, like any other outpouring of the human soul, comes to be written in order to see that what the man thought *last* he would write *first*.

You will find, if you recall the psalms which are familiar to most of us, that this is not any ingenuity of my own. 'The Lord is my shepherd, I shall not want.' That is a conclusion: thereafter the Psalmist gives you the process by which that conclusion was reached. 'I will lift up mine eyes unto the mountains,' says the writer of the 121st Psalm, which once again is obviously a conclusion, written by one who discovered that what had been wrong with him was that he had *not* been lifting up his eyes to the hills; he had been going about the world with his eyes anywhere but on the hills: and

so, lest he should forget it later on, he begins his psalm by committing himself beyond himself.

That, by the way, is a very ordinary introduction to a psalm. A good man sees that there is something which he ought to commit himself to, something which he must abandon or something which he must take up, and, lest he should lose his moral purpose in the rhetoric of his emotional mood, he pledges himself at the very beginning. He vows himself to something and confesses that if he fails *there* he will have put himself beyond the pale. Thus it is that you have any number of psalms which begin with 'I will'; and only thereafter does the good man tell you how it was that he needed so to commit himself.

I confess quite frankly that there are some psalms, and these almost the greatest, which arrive at no conclusion at all, where the poor soul after all his restless tossing seems at the end to see not one whit more clearly, or to feel more comfortable within himself and face to face with life. And I repeat,

these are the psalms which in my own view are the deepest and the dearest—where no conclusions at all are arrived at, where you simply see some man vexed and broken about life pouring out his heart ; and at the end, so far as we see, he has no further light. Now, why do I say that these are the psalms which in my own view are the deepest and dearest ? Victor Hugo in *Les Misérables*, in his description of that incomparably good man, the bishop, says amongst other things this : ‘ He was one of those men who could sit for a whole hour beside a man who had lost his wife—and say nothing.’ Now there are psalms in which I seem to see God simply sitting down by the side of some one who is heart-broken, allowing that one to say all sorts of wild, hard, rebellious things, knowing that it is good for the soul to rid itself of such perilous stuff. In those psalms I see God *listening*, allowing us to have it all out. Perhaps the fact that we can have it all out in a desperate hour is proof that beneath the surface and in the world of the Spirit there is a breast of God.

Well, this psalm is not one of those. This psalm arrives at a conclusion which, let me say again, you find at the outset. And the conclusion is a confession. It begins : ‘ Truly God is good to Israel.’ The man is rebuking himself for having thought otherwise. And then he proceeds to tell us how he himself had been to blame. ‘ As for me, my feet were almost gone ; my steps had well nigh slipped.’ The psalm, that is to say, begins with a confession by a man that he very nearly did something which he thanks God he did not do ; that he was on the point of going over a precipice of some kind, and he thanks God that something occurred to keep him back from its dizzy edge.

Now there is no more lyrical moment in the life of the human soul than the moment when we perceive that we have escaped from something. For those are the great moments in life which have still a touch of their opposite in them. The most lyrical time in any one’s life is a time of escape, a time when we pass out of one condition which threatened us into another condition in which we are liberated. That is the condition of this man. He begins by confessing that he very nearly did something which he did not do, very nearly thought something which he did not express, very nearly went over some precipice from which he thanks God he was delivered.

Let me dwell for a moment on that symbol of

slipping and almost going over a precipice. I remember long ago being in the Isle of Rousay in the Orkneys, which, like all the islands of the western sea, stands up sheer out of the ocean like a kind of table. On the side that faces the Atlantic, the Island of Rousay is precipitous. It is being eaten into by the sea, and in course of time it collapses bit by bit. When you are on the level of the water looking landwards you can see great galleries receding away into the heart of the island, while all around you

The ceaseless billows on the ocean’s breast
Break like a bursting heart and die in foam,
And thus at last find peace.

Walking across Rousay, you come across slits and cracks, some only a foot wide, some a yard wide, some ten yards wide, and some great gaps and chasms. The dangerous ones, obviously, are the narrow ones. Nobody thinks of trying to leap a ten-yard chasm, but many of us think we are able to leap a chasm about a foot wide. That is where the danger lies. If you look over the edge of such a chasm or slit you see the water writhing and wriggling away down beneath. Now, supposing a man almost slipped, almost missed his footing, but fell upon the other side, safe, just escaped. What an agony of happiness would be in that man’s heart ! And if as he rose he rested for a moment on his knees, and if he bethought himself of a psalm like this, surely he could get no better expression for his mood than this : ‘ My feet were almost gone ; my steps had well nigh slipped.’

Well then, what was it this man so narrowly escaped ? If I met a man in the street whose face was radiant, and if he told me that he had just escaped from something, I should conclude that he meant to say he had escaped from some moral transgression which would have publicly degraded him, or from something which would have embarrassed his life-interests. That is what we should think if a man who knew us told us, in confidence and breathlessly, that he had escaped from something which threatened him : we should suppose that he had felt the heat of some powerful temptation, and had almost yielded, but that something had intervened to distract him and to save him. Now the extraordinary and unique thing about this psalm is that this man who is thanking God so passionately for having escaped something, is not thinking about that kind of thing at all. What,

then, is it that he escaped from, for which he thanks God? I can only put it in this way. He thanks God *that he never yet adopted a low way of speaking about life*. But, you say, that is not much. Is it not? I say, weighing my words and in all sobriety, that it is a less heinous thing to fall from an ideal under the stress of some passion than not to be able to fall because you are down already. A low way of *thinking* about life is more disastrous to the human soul than a low way of *acting*, unless the low acting be simply the expression of the low thinking. I am perfectly sure, if we saw things as God sees them, we should feel that the one thing to be thankful for is that, in spite of life's stress and insinuations, we have not fallen into a low way of thinking about things, that we have not adopted the attitude of laughter and cynicism in this great world.

The good man proceeds to tell us how he was tempted to talk in a low way about life. It is the old story. He saw people whom he thought to be bad people getting on prosperously, and he saw people whom he knew to be good people not prospering at all. He describes it in his own inimitable way. 'They are not in trouble as other men; neither are they plagued like other men. . . . Their eyes stand out with fatness: they have more than heart could wish.' They have no scruples about God, and if any good man speaks to them about God they adopt a superior tone, and say, 'Tush, how doth God know?'—as though to say, 'My dear sir, I am sorry to find you so out of date.' Such people often thereupon proceed to give us odds and ends about astronomy—the distance from Sirius to the moon, the number of millions of years it has taken to lay the red sandstone—why?—in order to browbeat simple people out of the faith that God in heaven cares anything about them. 'The thing is preposterous!' But perhaps all religion is preposterous from the purely intellectual point of view. But that need not worry us, for there is no purely intellectual point of view. It is a preposterous thing, if you start from some points of view, to believe that God the creator of heaven and earth cares for you and me; but that is why we believe it, and it is just the kind of thing we are here to die for.

Well, he describes these people. There they were with no troubles. Their children were never taken ill. Their investments never turned out wrongly. Things seemed always to go their way. At the same time he saw, or thought he saw, people who had their scruples, good people, having a bad

time. As he thought about such things he became bitter; and, like all bitter people, he became not a little unjust. He supposed that all these rich people were having a happy time. He did not know that there is really not such a great difference between people when you know them. I myself have known rich people who had great sorrows, who lived with great simplicity, who to casual observers might have seemed proud and self-sufficient, who all the time were carrying some saving burden of pain, or grief. But when we are bitter we cannot do justice to anybody. This man by talking bitterly became more bitter, and by his own language darkened further this world already dark enough, until the awful idea offered itself to him that there is no such thing as goodness in the world, that the hypothesis of a final goodness at the heart of things is merely a desperate human cry. He tells us that as he pondered these people who had no scruples prospering, and the people who had scruples not prospering, he was almost coming to the conclusion that there is no difference between good and evil: his feet, in fact, had well-nigh slipped.

Now if we are right on the ultimate question we are right everywhere, and if we are wrong there we are wrong everywhere. I agree with Mr. Chesterton who is never so serious as when he appears to be merely amusing, that when he is arranging about rooms with a landlady, the first question he asks her is not what are her terms, but what is her total view of the universe; because, as Mr. Chesterton says with perfect cogency, if she is right there, she is right everywhere. In that case the coals will be right, the gas will be right, the food will be right; everything will be right if, to that woman, this world means God, and life means duty. She is right everywhere if her total view of the universe is right. But if her total view of the universe be cynical, that the moral order is something which you can dodge and manage, then because she is altogether wrong she is wrong everywhere.

Now that is what this good man very nearly committed himself to. He tells us he had come to think this; and he very nearly *said* it. But, you say, if a man thinks a thing he ought to say it. No: a thousand times! There are ten thousand things which come to us which we must never indulge by expressing. There are reminiscences in each of us of all sorts of things we have passed through. Waves of thought roll over us; yet in a sense we are not responsible for them. But if I *say* a thing,

then I have given the assent of my whole personality to that thing ; I have made it my own. Thoughts come to me which I cry out against, and shudder at, protesting to God that they do not belong to me. But if I say a thing, no power on earth could have compelled me to say it unless in that region of the will where if anywhere I am myself I had assented.

Now this good man tells us that the thought or idea occurred to him and urged itself breathlessly upon him that the best way to deal with life is—to laugh at the whole thing ; that there is nothing good or evil ; that things are what they are, and that he is a wise man who will not allow a merely moral scruple to spoil his chances in life. He tells us he very nearly said *that*. But something stopped him. Now what was it that stopped him ? Well, there was one thing that half stopped him. He said : ‘ But if I say this thing, if I say, “ Surely I have cleansed my heart in vain and washed my hands in innocency ” ; if I say, “ Surely I have been a fool to try to be a good man,”—then I should offend against the generation of God’s children. I should have to turn my mother’s portrait to the wall. If I take up this diabolical view of life, that there is nothing in it that relates a man to others and relates him to God, I shall be insulting the testimony of God’s children through all ages and putting myself on the side not only of the sad ones but on the side of the bad ones.’ That, I say, half stopped him. But he still went on thinking about it. The problem was not eased in his soul and he did not know what to say, until he did a very wonderful thing. *He rushed into a church* : ‘ I went into the sanctuary of God.’

There is great art in knowing *where* to put your questions. The fact is there is no real answer in terms of yes or no to any of life’s final questions. But we may be brought into such circumstances that we do not want to ask such questions. There are certain questions which we do not ask in certain places. There are places—the surgical ward of some great hospital, or a theatre where some major operation is taking place—where we would be ashamed to ask any rebellious questions arising out of our own personal fortunes. Perhaps the final virtue of the Cross of Calvary is just there—that Christ died upon the cross to silence our mere querulousness ; for we are ashamed to ask a merely bitter question about life face to face with Christ who without bitterness died upon the cross in love with God and men.

This man went into a church. We do not know what he saw in particular in that church, but in substance he would see just what he would see in any church. He might see some little children being dedicated, as with us in baptism, being brought to the temple as our Lord was brought to the temple in His babyhood, and held up in the arms of father and mother—being offered, as it were, to God. And as he looked at those little children, something may have gone soft within him—just as something went soft in that rich young ruler in the New Testament. For what softened the heart of that rich young ruler was that he saw Jesus laying His hands on little children. Afterwards, when Jesus had come away from the children, this rich young ruler, we are told, ran after Him. ‘ Master,’ he said, ‘ what must I do to get into that kind of secret ? I am only a rich man. There are things I can buy. There are even people I can buy. But I learned a moment ago when I saw Thee stand in the sun with those children that there are some things that money cannot buy. Tell me, good Master, how I can get there.’

It may have been something like that which softened his heart. Or he may have seen some old saint praying in the darkness, such as we might see any day in a Continental cathedral. But, whatever he saw, one big thing came into his mind. He said—these people are right or there is nothing right. They may be wrong in all sorts of ways, in manners and in speech. But they are finally right. In any case I had rather be wrong with them than right with those proud and swelling creatures whose prosperity is indeed the enormous shadow blasting life. Now, that is faith, for faith is the victory over the world.

Thereafter this man did something which none of us does often enough or thoroughly enough. He took himself out a walk ; and there and then said things to himself which no one would have dared to say. ‘ The spirit of a man,’ says the Bible, ‘ is the candle of the Lord.’ What you, in the depths of your soul, can say about yourself is what God is going to say about you later on. In the end of the days God is going to say nothing about you that you would not say about yourself now if you had the courage. It is a deep and awesome saying, that the spirit of a man is the candle of the Lord. Suppose all the lights in the church were extinguished, and I were to bring in a candle and light it, and were to wait. In a few moments, by the light of that

solitary candle, we should all be able to see everything characteristic in the building. We should see all the other faces, for a human face is quick to catch light; and we should see the shape and the principal architectural features of the place. Of course, we should not see everything *clearly*; but what we did see by the candle, by daylight we should see only more clearly. What we see in ourselves in lucid and candid moments God sees with perfect clearness.

And so I say, and the Psalmist is my guide, that it is an extremely good thing to go away by ourselves after one of these crises. We had all indeed better meet our crisis on our knees; but, after we have met and triumphed over it, we would do well to put the enemy to rout by having a walk and a talk with ourselves alone. This good man (for a man is a good man who has become aware even of the good fight)—this good man said—and here I am not really going from the actual text—‘You are a fine fellow; and that was a nice view of life you were philandering with! You made a great to-do about God not governing this world; when the fact is all that had really happened to you was that you were envious of unscrupulous people who seem to prosper.’ As he laid the lash on himself stroke after stroke, he cried, ‘O Lord, it is all true. O Lord, I was as a beast before Thee.’ Now he meant that; he chose just that word *beast*, and we ought not to quarrel with it on grounds of taste, for he knew his own business. He had indeed envied cattle their stoutness and their placidity; forgetting for the moment that you cannot have it every way; that a cow has no sense of the landscape, no understanding of poetry; that Wordsworth will always be lost on

a cow. ‘So foolish was I, and ignorant: I was as a beast before Thee.’

He closes with a fine saying: ‘Nevertheless I am continually with Thee.’ Surely the translation should rather be: ‘Nevertheless I am with Thee henceforth and to the end.’ That is to say—Lord, never again shall I be tempted to speak with laughter and cynicism about this great life of ours. Thou mayst catch me yet in many a sorry byway of the spirit; but never henceforth in that particular corner.

There are two ways of living, two ways of viewing life. There is the laughing, cynical, atheistic, unbelieving way; and there is the big way. There are two ways of playing the game. There is the big way and there is the rotten way. You and I are again and again inclined to think in a poor way about life. We have often very good reason. I do not want to speak easily about life; for life is such a baffling thing that God had to send His own Son into the world to encourage us to hold on. Faith is the substantiation of things hoped for; it is a conviction concerning things not seen. Faith is obedience to the highest possible hypothesis about life—that the best is the truth. Of course faith will always be confronted with an apparently contradicting world. I say of course: for otherwise, deprived, that is to say, of difficulties and obstacles and the haunting menace of its own alternative, faith would die out of the soul.

What then? Shall we whine? Shall we curse? Or—shall we pray?

Meanwhile, the silent lip!

Meanwhile, the climbing feet!

Recent Foreign Theology.

Arabia in the Bible.¹

THE notices of Arabia which occur in the Old Testament have been investigated by numerous savants, among whom the most famous are probably Sprenger and Glaser. Though the work of Dr. Moritz does not mention the Bible in its title, the second half is devoted to a study of Solomon's

¹ Von B. Moritz, *Arabien: Studien zur physikalischen und historischen Geographie des Landes* (Hanover, 1923).

expedition to Ophir, while the first half, though not exclusively Biblical, contains many suggestions for the interpretation or illustration of Biblical texts. The author is one of the few scholars who have travelled in Arabia, and indeed with the camera, which has enabled him to present his readers with a number of successful photographs. But he also brings to bear on his subject profound acquaintance with the literature of the Arabs, which is indeed removed by many centuries from

the latest of the Biblical books, but owing to the general stability of Arabian institutions can here and there be utilized for the understanding of Biblical times.

This stability is only relative, and comparison between the references in the Old Testament, the later poetry, and the present time, exhibits changes even in the natural features of the country. The lion, about whom the classical poetry knows so much, and for whom it has so many names, is not now found in the peninsula. More surprising still is the general disappearance of the *tree*; in Is 21¹³ the caravans of Dedan (identified by Janssen and Savignac with al-'Ula) are threatened with nights to be spent in the forest, among the wild beasts; there are now no forests where they could lodge! Accumulations of sand have left old ports far inland. Such is probably the case with Ezion Geber, felicitously interpreted by Dr. Moritz as *The Ghadā bushes of Geber*, the name of their whilom owner.

This was the port whence Solomon and his ally Hiram sent ships to the Eldorado Ophir, whence they brought four hundred and twenty *kikkar* of gold. Since it would appear from the earliest account that the kings sent one ship apiece, the question arises how they procured this quantity of the precious metal. Two ships were scarcely sufficient for a warlike expedition; if, on the other hand, they were engaged in peaceful trade, what goods could they carry for which such a sum could be given in exchange? For the products of Palestine, being all agricultural, would scarcely provide in the cargo of two ships sufficient for such a price. Dr. Moritz's suggestion, that the cargo carried was one of slaves, seems to answer this question very imperfectly. He himself emphasizes the small dimensions of the craft employed; and a cargo of slaves, if carried for any considerable distance, would require extra provision of food and water, such as inanimate goods would not require; and if very high prices were to be demanded for the slaves, their accommodation in the vessels would have to be such as would make

it likely that they would survive the voyage. If, on the other hand, the amount of gold brought back is enormously exaggerated, it is difficult to see why any record of such an expedition should be preserved. Yet neither war nor trade seems to account for the procuring of an enormous quantity with two boats of a few tons' burden. And indeed the narrative says nothing of either; it seems to think of Ophir as a place where gold was to be had in any quantity, like Sindbad's Valley of Precious Stones.

It remains to locate Ophir; and Dr. Moritz thinks the place intended must be somewhere on the Arabian coast; among other reasons he urges the difficulty which these craft would have encountered in negotiating the Bab al-Mandeb. On the other hand, whereas the Biblical narrative allows three years for the voyage, Dr. Moritz would reduce it to six months. Ophir has to be located in his opinion in some gold-bearing region probably belonging to the ancient kingdom of Saba.

It is, of course, the case that Ophir is mentioned in the genealogical table (Gn 10²⁹) as a son of Joktan, whose family are located in Arabia. Some names in that list can be identified either certainly or probably with Arabian localities. Ophir, however, cannot be; and the possibility must be considered that Ophir may have been regarded as the brother of Havilah, which seems capable of being identified in Arabia, on the ground of the connexion of both with gold.

If what the expedition did was neither to raid nor to trade, but to collect gold by working, then the length of time taken and the quantity obtained justify each other; and it is possible that the Biblical historian meant by Ophir no more than 'the gold country.' One can even imagine reasons why the whereabouts of such a place should be kept secret.

Dr. Moritz's work will be very generally welcomed for the fresh light which it brings to bear on the historical geography of Arabia and the Biblical allusions to that country.

D. S. MARGOLIOUTH.

Religious Experience and the New Psychology.¹

BY THE REVEREND F. J. RAE, M.A., DIRECTOR OF RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION, ABERDEEN.

THE Christian religion has passed through several critical tests in the last hundred years. New sciences have appeared which taught the world to do without God. Physical science, in the flush of its great triumphs, explained the processes of nature without the need of Divine intervention. Then came the science of Criticism which in its turn traced the course and development of the Biblical literature, proving conclusively that there was no necessity for any Divine Author to account for the facts. Finally, the science of Comparative Religion, discovering that man has everywhere and always been religious, proclaimed that religion is a natural product, and that no one religion is any truer than another, thus disposing of Revelation. The menace to religious faith of these sciences has, however, now largely faded away. Natural science and religion are very good friends. Criticism has rendered to living faith a really great service. And even Comparative Religion has furnished a new weapon to Apologetics in the discovery that man is incurably religious.

To-day there is a fresh menace, but it is the same old 'enemy.' Science, Criticism, and Comparative Religion attempted to show that God was not a reality by simply explaining the processes by which things happened. And it is a somewhat significant fact that the newest science, that of Psychology in its latest development, employs the same argument. It explains the process of religious experience and thereby (according to some of its most influential exponents) explains away its reality. But what is the 'New Psychology'? And why is it the 'New' that is a menace? The difference between the New and the Old Psychology is very simple. Orthodox Psychology dealt with the conscious mind and its processes. Reason and will had a large and important place in its account of mental life. The New Psychology reverses all

this. The conscious region is a very small part of the mind. The really important, and by far the largest, region of the mind is the unconscious. There are to be found the instincts that are the real factors in mental life. Round them the whole life of the mind is organized. By them it is shaped. Our beliefs, our morality, our choices, our conduct are determined by these forces in the unconscious. All the memories of the past are there, all the influences of heredity, all the real energy of mind, the emotions and interests and desires and tendencies that form character and inspire action. It is in many respects a terrible region, this unconscious. According to men like Freud it is little less than disgusting. Even the best of the New Psychologists shake their heads over it. Of course it has its good elements. But the thing to realize is that it is the decisive formative influence that *does* things and shapes things. We imagine we are reasonable beings, but we are not. Reason plays a very menial part in life. Its chief business is to find arguments to justify our instinctive actions. We do not act reasonably; we act instinctively. There are notable instances of this, as, *e.g.*, the formation of morality; but there are numberless commonplace examples of the same thing. Instinct decides for us, and then we proceed to 'rationalize' this act, giving fine names to it and finding a really respectable source for it. The putative parentage of our acts and beliefs is, however, very different from the real parentage.

The most striking example of this is religion. Not all the New Psychologists are unbelievers, of course, any more than all scientists were atheists or all critics sceptics. There are many who are devout believers. But the tendency of the New Science in the flush of its new vision is towards a subjectivism which makes religious experience simply a product of the mind. There are different ways of putting this. Religion is sometimes represented to be the projection outside ourselves of an ideal in the form of God in order to bring life and nature into harmony. To this desire for unity we owe the formation of philosophical systems, and also the idea of a moral order of the universe. The mind feels an imperious necessity for harmony

¹ A. G. Tansley, *The New Psychology and its Relation to Life*; W. S. Swisher, *Religion and the New Psychology: A Psycho-Analytic Study of Religion*; Oscar Pfister, *Some Applications of Psycho-Analysis*; R. H. Thouless, *An Introduction to the Psychology of Religion*; Ruth Rouse and H. Crichton Miller, *Christian Experience and Psychological Processes*; F. R. Barry, *Christianity and Psychology*.

within itself. Hence its projection of a religious creed. Another way of accounting for religious belief is to say that it is the embodiment of our need of consolation, or, again, of the qualities necessary to the herd. 'God always stands for what is felt to be in the interests of humanity.' It is the usefulness of 'God' to us that determines our belief in Him. The mind throws up a rope into the heavens, in the manner of the Indian juggler, and then climbs up the rope. 'At this stage of development consciousness is perpetually deceiving itself about the contents and working of the mind, perpetually constructing false harmonies which break down at the test of experience. The most permanently successful of these protective devices are those which project the ideal unification of the mind into a supernatural sphere where it is safe from direct attack, and can be guarded and treasured for the guidance and consolation of those who can find no guidance or consolation in the natural world. This safeguarding of the ideal, eventually hedged about with all the authority of a great herd organization—the Church—has indeed resulted in the relative permanence of a high standard of life and conduct which has been of incalculable benefit to mankind. But the results of even this great and sustained effort at unification fail to resist the assaults of rational scepticism and the slow sapping effect of increasing objective knowledge.' These sentences are quoted from Tansley because he is the sanest of those who occupy this standpoint. Freud's sex obsession is not shared by many other psychologists, and the efforts of followers of his, like Swisher, are more amusing than disturbing. According to Swisher, Paul was a neurotic suffering from a violently repressed love-life. His trouble was the Œdipus complex. This was his thorn in the flesh. Job also suffered from a heavy neurosis, though happily in his case he was psycho-analysed and got relief. It was otherwise with 'Ecclesiastes.' He unhappily was an unharmonized neurotic suffering from a violent repression, in short from the Œdipus complex again. Modesty forbids me explaining what an Œdipus complex is, but it seems to have been very catching among Biblical writers.

One thing may indeed be reckoned to the New Psychology for righteousness. It has made a contribution to apologetics of a valuable kind. Its reduction of the importance of the purely rational function of the mind, however exaggerated,

contains a valuable truth. The emphasis on instinct and emotion and on their place in life is simply an echo of the teaching of Scripture as to the way in which we know God. Roughly speaking, the 'Unconscious' is what the Bible means by 'the heart'; and of this Jesus says: 'Blessed are the pure in heart for they shall see God,' while Paul says: 'With the heart man believeth unto righteousness.' In other words, all through the Bible it is experience that is the avenue to the knowledge of God and to certainty about Him. We do not reach God by arguing about Him. We do not obtain faith by the way of reason. And one of the things the New Psychology has done is to strike a blow at that cold rationalism which is as impotent as it is uninspiring. The prominence given to the practical elements in the life of the mind helps us to understand and value the religious life and assurance of simple people in whom the rational side has not been developed, but who know through the discipline of life Him in whom they have believed.

1. What have we to say, however, in reply to the presentation of religious experience as a purely subjective product of the mind, created at the instance of our desires and interests or by suggestion from others, a projection of our ideal self into the infinite, a rationalization of our desire for comfort and peace? Two things may be said to begin with. One is that in this contention psychology goes entirely out of its own province and beyond its own powers. Physical science made the same error fifty years ago. The business of science is to collect and arrange facts and laws. Their significance is the business of philosophy. The business of psychology as a science is to describe the working of the mind. It has no right whatever to go beyond this and interpret the facts in their ultimate meaning. That is the work of philosophy. In the strict sense the theory of religious faith as a projection or rationalization is an impertinence. The question of the source and working of states of mind is one thing. The question of the reality and validity of the objects to which these states point is quite another thing. It is a very common fallacy to judge the worth of a process by its origin instead of by its goal, and the theory under consideration is of this nature. Of course the psychologist may not go so far in words as to theorize about origins. He may content himself with analysing the process by which he believes religious belief to have been developed and then simply shrug his

shoulders. 'Metaphysics is not my business,' he says, 'but that is how faith arises, and the conclusion is obvious.' But in point of fact the conclusion he points to is anything but obvious. The question of objective validity has not been touched. It should be recognized clearly that all psychology can possibly assert is that psychological analysis by itself cannot prove the real existence of the objects of faith. That is the obvious conclusion, and it is a perfectly sound one. Physical science cannot prove the existence of God, but the facts which it has gathered and the laws it has discovered may by a process outside the field of science be conducted to a perfectly reasonable conclusion as to the existence and the operation of a Divine creative working behind these facts and laws. Pratt uses the following illustration of this point. He imagines that the human race is living in sunlight but that most men are blind and only a few are able to see. One of the blind psychologists could prove conclusively that the opening of the eyes in the case of those who saw was the cause of the light sensations, and fully explained them, no reference being needed to the sun or any outer source. Not a single element in the experience of seeing the sun would be unexplained by the psychological analysis. And from the psychological point of view the blind psychologist would be perfectly right. But the question of the reality of the sun would be unaffected by the analysis. The application to the theory of projection is obvious. But the same thing may be said of the theory that religious experience is due to suggestion. This may be true in many cases, but the fact does not in any way touch the question of the reality to which the experience points. Suggestion is used to implant true ideas in the mind as well as false ideas, and the question whether the ideas are true or false is not decided by the fact of suggestion. As Thouless points out, the fact of suggestion is completely irrelevant to the question of the truth or validity of belief. The conclusion, then, to which we are led so far is that nothing psychology has discovered is decisive as to the reality of the objects of religious faith. This is to be decided in other ways and by other criteria. As soon as this limitation is recognized the negative suggestion of such terms as 'projection,' 'rationalization' and 'idealization' loses its force.

2. The second consideration referred to is that the argument against the validity of religious experience contained in the analysis of the New

Psychology would abolish *all* reality in an objective sense. What is said of religious experience must be said of other kinds of experience. If God is a projection of the mind, so, in the same sense and on the same grounds, is external nature. The unity which the mind finds in the external world would thus be a rationalization of experience to bring to the mind that harmony which it desires. It is a projection of the need of the mind into the 'outer' world. This is frankly asserted to be the case in regard to morality. There is no objective standard of ethics. There is no 'absolute' morality. Moral law is the creation of the herd instinct which imposes on the individual conduct which is useful, and even necessary, for the cohesion, and indeed the very existence, of the herd. But this has no authority other than the force which the herd can exert. The only final moral authority is the individual mind which in the last resort can and ought to recognize no authority but its 'ethical self.'

But all this is equally true of an external world. If we are to follow the suggestion of the New Psychology, the idealist interpretation of mental experience is absolutely impregnable. There seems no more reason for believing in the objective reality of the sensible facts of perception than there is for believing in the supersensible facts of religious life. What we do in the first case is to project a world of 'objects' outside ourselves, and we do so because we want a sense of stability in our experience. If you reply that all men see an outside world and believe themselves to be in contact with objective reality, that would not be convincing to the New Psychologist. The same consideration would prove the objective character of religious experience because religion is universal also. And the answer in both cases is identical, viz., that the mind is the same everywhere and acts in the same way. Men are everywhere and always religious because they have the same needs and the same minds and the same instincts. But this applies also to the objects of perception in the world around. We all 'see' an external world because our minds are alike and our needs alike.

It is obvious enough that the conclusion of such an argument is total scepticism as to all reality. And this seems to be implicitly confessed by a writer like Tansley in his definition of truth. He says that God is a necessity to the human race, and will long continue to be so. 'If this be so, we

cannot deny the "truth" of the substance of religion, though we may criticise many of its forms. All universal and self-consistent expressions of the activity of the human spirit have a claim to the name of "truth." It is clear, of course, that religious truth is incommensurate with scientific truth, just as for instance mathematical truth is incommensurate with artistic truth' (p. 161). The point to be stressed here is the definition of 'truth' as the universal and self-consistent expression of the human spirit. That is a good description of the psychological standpoint, but if it is taken as a complete definition of truth it excludes all objective reality, and in consistency with this we should regard as the creation of the mind not only religious experiences and philosophical systems and morality, but the belief in a concrete basis of perception. When we have led the psychologist gently forward on his own path to the goal of a complete scepticism, we may leave him there to recover his breath. It may be added, however, that the 'given' nature of religious experience, especially when it is unexpected and cuts across habit and instinct (as it often does), has the same character of objective reality as the facts and events of the external world which impress themselves on the mind as new objects of perception.

3. Turning from these preliminary considerations, however, let us see what is to be said of a positive kind on the problem before us. A fact of a helpful nature is obvious—the support in this matter which is offered by Reason and Instinct to one another. One serious defect of the New Psychology is its attitude to reason. Reason plays a very subordinate rôle in the web of experience. It is very much the servant of the Unconscious. It is always at the disposal of the great instincts, to give their choice an air of decency and equity. This is a theory which will not bear examination. We are indebted to the New Psychology for much, and a great deal it says of our instinctive life is not only true but helpful. It appears to me, however, that the part played by the Unconscious in life is seriously exaggerated, and that the rôle of the conscious and especially of the self-conscious reason is seriously underestimated. Is it a true account of human beings to say that they are the creatures of instinct, that their 'will' is only a kind of 'urge' in a certain direction under the impulse of emotion, and that the conscious mind does little more than register decisions taken for them by the unconscious self?

The whole history of man seems to me to show that this is largely untrue, and it will be found to be one of the positions of the new science of mind which cannot be maintained. Reason has played a great part in the mental life of man and plays a great part to-day. It is not the chief instrument of religious experience. It is not the way by which faith is reached. But it is a final court of appeal for all the constructions of the human spirit. We cannot continue to believe what it condemns. We cannot continue to practise what it rejects. It has a power of serene judgment and a power of large vision which both play their part in the building up of religious beliefs. It would not be much of an exaggeration to say that reason is that which makes man what he is. It is not the servant but the master in the house of life. And it is in virtue of the exercise of his reason in the long history of his mind that man has achieved his greatest triumphs and vindicated his place as the greatest of the works of God.

If this be a true account of man then reason plays a far greater part in mental life than the New Psychology allows; and its independent deliverance supports the witness of religious experience. Reason, looking out on the world, perceives everywhere an order in nature; and, looking out on history, discovers an increasing purpose in the progressive life of man. But these facts point to an Author of Nature who is intelligent and a Presence in the life of man that guides the ship of life to its haven. But this is just what religious experience everywhere and always witnesses. And the congruence of these two instruments of truth, the reason and the 'heart,' self-conscious mind that looks before and after, and the experience of life that finds God in its own deepest and truest moments, is one of the things that points steadily to the objective worth and validity of religious experience. 'If,' writes Thouless on the last page of his interesting book, 'we find that by following the dictates of religious experience, we build up a system which, on the whole, corresponds with the religious system built up from consideration of the other types of relevant experience—i.e. the facts of the natural world, the historical facts of religions, and the facts of the moral consciousness; then we have a very impressive argument for the general validity of religious experience.'

4. In his remarkably able and suggestive volume on *Christianity and Psychology*, Mr. F. R. Barry

works out another line of argument. Stated generally, his contention is that the facts with which psychology is occupied as well as the methods of psycho-therapy really *presuppose*, as their own postulate, the Christian interpretation of the Universe, and will only 'work' if that is assumed to be true. The line of argument is as follows. Psychology speaks a great deal of personality, of unifying it and harmonizing it, and so on. But by what right does psychology speak of 'personality' or 'self' at all? Which of our many 'selves' is the personality? It assumes we have an ideal of personality before us. But that is what, from psychology alone, we do not have. We have only a chaos of 'complexes' and impulses, fragmentary, competing for expression. On the ground of psychology we have no hope of integrating these into a personality. Psychology therefore must start with an *a priori* judgment about the existence and meaning of Personality. But this drives you back to the conclusion that for an unlimited number of different selves there must be a Perfect Personality, because the conflicts and discords of the individual subject can be reconciled only in a single and unified personal life. It is impossible to say that there is an ideal life for each unless there is an ideal life for all. Thus there must be, in the nature of Reality, some fixed ideal and goal of personal life before you can have any warrant for assuming that there is an ideal life for the individual. But an ideal of personality cannot be other than personal itself. And if it is an ideal for all persons, it cannot be one person among others; it must be a perfect all-including life from which all other persons derive their meaning. We must therefore start with the recognition of God as the pre-condition of perfected human life. 'Without the fundamental assumption . . . of personality at the back of things, there is no possibility of constructive thinking. . . . On no other terms will psychology make sense.'

This seems to me an impressive argument. It is, in another form, the fact which I have already suggested, that you have to go outside psychology if you are to 'make sense' not only of experience, but of psychology itself. The same argument is derived from the New Psychology in its practical form as psycho-analysis. The aim of psycho-therapy is to restore the personality to what it ought to be. But how do we know what it ought to be? Where is the standard to which it is to

conform? Education, *e.g.*, is the development of personality. But a teacher must have in his mind an ideal of personality to which he is to bring his pupils. He will not simply seek to make them develop according to their own tendencies, which may be all wrong. Where is the standard of personality to which we are to conform the individual? Here, again, you need an ideal personality, and the faith of the Christian supplies, and alone fully supplies, the need.

5. In any attempt to reproduce the state of the argument on this great subject at the present time (which is all I am attempting to do in this article) the suggestion made by Thouless in his concluding chapter must not be omitted. Thouless is painfully cautious in his statements, and before he puts down his foot anywhere he tests the ground carefully to see if it will bear his weight. This gives his judgment greater influence, though perhaps he is too suspicious of the solidity of the ground that tempts him forward. What he is seeking is a criterion to establish the validity of religious experience, and, after pressing his foot in one direction and another and drawing it back from them all, he finally makes a definite advance. And the ground he occupies is this. The power of a religious doctrine to rationalize (that is, to give a coherent, intelligible, and reasonably simple account of) experience is a criterion (however imperfect) of its truth. This is not to say that the truth of a doctrine is its power to rationalize experience, but that 'a doctrine rationalizes experience because it has, certainly in a limited and relative way, that relation to an objective reality which we call *truth*.' Thouless points out that this is the criterion used to test the truth of a scientific theory. A scientific theory is true because it gives a coherent and intelligible account of all the available facts. And this criterion he extends to the religious sphere. Its limitations are carefully indicated by Thouless. The probability of error, however, is small if the experiences used cover a wide range and if the explanation is the same in all. 'The fact that the belief in God rationalizes, let us say, our experience of the moral conflict, will be one piece of evidence in favour of the view that the belief in God is a true one. If we find that this same belief also rationalizes the facts of religious experience the evidence is proportionately strengthened, and so on for all the experience we can investigate which is relevant to the belief in question.' A more general way of

putting Thouless's argument is to say that religious truth roots the great values of life, truth, beauty and goodness, in reality, and that unless this is valid the universe is a chaos. Very likely this way of putting the matter would make Thouless draw his foot back again in alarm. But if it is more general or more philosophical (in the narrow sense) it is none the less true. If I am asked to live for goodness, truth, or beauty, I want to know if these things are big enough to claim my loyalty, that is to say, real enough. And this means: Are they rooted in the ultimate truth of things? It is quite true the mind *does* crave for harmony in the universe. But it is infinitely more likely that this is because the universe is meant to satisfy this deep instinct than that the unity of things is a mere figment of the rationalizing tendency of the mind.

There is something infinitely pathetic in the New Psychology when it comes face to face with the question: What are you going to offer to humanity in place of the religious truth which is a pure creation of the mind without any 'objective' reality? What is the hope of the world? The only things our new science can offer are an extension of the herd instinct until it becomes as wide as humanity, and a development of the tender feeling which is rooted in human nature. This is a melancholy prospect. For there is absolutely no reason

whatever to suppose the herd instinct will spread and become more general. Experience is all the other way. It separates men into groups which fight each other and hate each other. The herd instinct creates employers and employed, German and French, conservatives and radicals. It shows no tendency to produce a brotherhood of humanity, because there is nothing in it to produce such a great fellowship. That is a pure creation of religion, and is possible only when God is believed in as the Universal Father.

As to the growth of a tender feeling in human beings, there is no ground at all for believing this to be in any but a limited and sectional way characteristic of human nature. It is found in the family, but it is notorious that family feeling may exist with the most intense selfishness and exclusiveness, and we have no reason to think that the tenderness within the family will spread so as to include those who are strangers, but rather the opposite. The spiritual bankruptcy which these reflexions point to in the New Psychology is no proof of the truth of religious experience. But at any rate such a consideration will make us look carefully at the credentials of a system which (so far as religious truth is concerned) may be purely destructive, and can offer nothing to take the place of what, after all, has been the foster-nurse of all that has been great in the life of man.

In the Study.

A Prayer.

Merciful God, Thou kind and loving Father, we thank Thee that Thou hast created us, that in Jesus Christ Thou hast redeemed us, and that by Thy Holy Spirit Thou hast called us into Thy fellowship and service. We thank Thee with all our heart for the kindness which Thou hast bestowed upon us during the time that is past. Thou hast protected us from danger to body and soul; Thou hast enriched us with blessings beyond our knowledge; and with much patience Thou hast borne with our faults.

We are not worthy of all the mercy which Thou hast shown to us, and we pray with hearty repent-

ance for pardon of any evil we have done, and of our constant misuse of Thy grace. Enter not into judgment with Thy servants, but let Thy compassion in Jesus Christ wash us from all our guilt.

O Thou who art the Keeper of Israel, Thou who neither slumberest nor sleepest, be Thou the Guardian of our lives. We commend to Thy gracious care our bodies and our spirits, our possessions and our powers, our waking and sleeping, our life and death. Cover us with Thy hand, and keep us from all evil and from every fear. O Lord, our hope is in Thee; let Thy love be our shield, and guard us unto life eternal, through Jesus Christ our Saviour. Amen.

Virginibus Puerisque.**Passing.¹**

'Ready to distribute.'—I Ti 6¹⁸.

That means sharing things, passing on our good things, playing the game together and not each for his own hand.

I heard a missionary speaker once tell of the most remarkable football team he had ever seen. It was at Beyrout, I think, and was organized by a young Scottish missionary. The centre forward was an Armenian, the forwards on either wing were Turks. There were a couple of Jews, a negro, a Copt, and a few other odds and ends; a mixture like the Tower of Babel, of nations that usually hated each other and did each other all the harm they could. Yet they were all playing in one football team, brought together by the power of Jesus.

The missionary said he was told that the most difficult thing to teach these men was to pass to each other. Every one was keen to dart down the field and score the goal himself; and when their teacher had got a man to understand that he must play, not for himself, but for the team, when he had taught him to pass, he knew he had done a great thing not only for the team, but for that man's own life.

Now that is just what St. Paul means when he says Christians must be 'ready to distribute.' They must learn to pass.

Our world in Europe is to-day in a terrible mess because every nation is playing its own game. They are fixed on their own plans. They want to mend the trouble in their own way. They want to score the goals and gather the glory single-handed. This won't do in football and it won't do in the big game of life; and things will never be right until each nation forgets itself and denies itself, and all pull together for the good of all.

In our own nation we see the same thing. We were one nation in the War, pulling together like one team, all ready to give up something of our own for the sake of the nation. That is how we got on and won the War.

Now we are all at sixes and sevens. Miners, engineers, employers, workmen, each determined on his own score, and nobody scoring at all for that very reason. It isn't a team when every player is playing on his own and won't pass to the next man, and we aren't a nation to-day. We are just a lot of

By the Reverend Stuart Robertson, M.A., Glasgow.

jostling people, not playing the game, not 'ready to distribute.'

This is the secret of life for every one of us. The great lesson is to learn to pass. If you have comfort, it isn't yours only. Pass it on. There are others who are being starved on the wing because you don't pass to them. They lose heart and interest and fall out of the game discouraged. Pass on your comfort, your friendship, your money, pass out and play the game for the team. This is the spirit of our Master. It is what He did; and being a Christian means just this, being 'ready to distribute.'

Look farther than our own nation. We have good news to give, the news of the love of God that Jesus Christ brought. That isn't our own for ourselves only. There are thousands in the world who know nothing about it. It's for them too. We have got to pass it on. That is what we call Foreign Missions. I call it just playing the game. These heathen people are being starved of what they have a right to and a great need of, because so many Christians at home say they don't believe in Foreign Missions, or, while they say they believe, give so little and show so little interest that it is plain they don't really believe at all.

God wants us all to be one, playing like a team for His kingdom, all the nations together for God, all the people in each nation together for God, all for each and each for all. We are fond of the words 'my' and 'mine,' but when Jesus taught us to pray He left these words out, and told us to say 'our'—*Our* Father, *our* daily bread, *our* sins, *our* temptations. 'Ready to distribute,' says St. Paul, 'bear one another's burdens,' 'share in all good things,' 'members of each other,' playing the game together under our Captain, Christ.

If we come to Him, the first lesson He will teach us, the hardest to learn, the most worth learning for it is the key to a happy life, will be to learn to pass.

Smudges.²

'Saved; yet so as by fire.'—I Co 3¹⁵.

Have you ever noticed, what one can see now and then, a black smudge on the skin of an orange, sometimes faint and sometimes darker, that you can wipe away, or that comes off upon your fingers? And do you know how it comes there? A friend of mine, who has a great fruit farm at the other side

² By the Reverend A. J. Gossip, M.A., Aberdeen.

of the world, once told me about it. It's like this. They have a beautiful climate yonder, sunny and bright and hot, but once in a while, just when the oranges are beginning to ripen, there comes a touch of frost at night. And that would mean the ruin of the whole crop for the year. So they have to guard against it somehow, and what they do is this. Whenever the evening sets in cold, and they think frost is coming, they put long rows of twinkling little oil lamps, one under each orange bush, and that keeps the air warm enough to save the fruit. But, as you who live in the country know, oil lamps can be dreadfully smoky (can't they?), and that's where the smudge came from. It is quite a good orange, it may be sweet enough, but it was almost lost. The frost came, and it was just saved. It was saved only by fire, and there's the mark on it still. And most of us have got marks and smudges like that upon us too. Not on our hands and faces! Mother, of course, would never allow that! Every time you are in a hurry and scamp your washing, though it looks all right to you, she always sees that there is something wrong, a tide mark left up on your forehead, or down on your neck. And she won't have soiled hands when you sit down at table.

No, but the marks on us are deeper in, are on our heart and mind and soul. Between you and me, you really are a fairly idle little rascal, aren't you? Take that practising of yours! How you try to wriggle out of it, and what scores of excuses you can make! And even when you are at last pinned down to the piano with whole twenty minutes to go, you don't try much, now do you? You twiddle at this, and give it up; and take to something else, and rattle through it till you come to a hard bit. And, 'Bother, I can't do it, anyway time must be up.' And off you rush to the clock, and your face falls. 'Only ten minutes!' And back again, but by and by, well, it must be over now; and off to the clock again. 'Only twelve minutes!' Why, it must have stopped! No! Well, at any rate it's a wee bit past the twelve, we'll call it thirteen. And you crawl once more to the piano, and your eyes light on the maker's name, and London. That sets you dreaming. 'I wish I were in London, to see the Tower, and the Zoo, and all the rest of it.' And then you waken up and off to the clock. Time's up, and that's finished! Yet you haven't really practised, not one little bit. And by and by when you grow up one piece of you won't have grown up at all! You'll be able to talk, that bit has grown all right;

and to walk, that bit has grown; but not to play music, that bit of you will be still a baby that can't do anything. And all your life you will carry the ugly smudge of that stupid idleness of yours.

And there are other marks deeper in yet, away in our souls. You can rub off the smudge on an orange, but these have to stand. For living life is like an examination where there is no rubbing out allowed. If you put down a silly thing, you can say later, that is all wrong, and do it better, but it all has to go in. Every time that you get huffy, or fly into a passion, remember that that makes a smoky mark upon your soul, and it doesn't come off. There is a man in the Bible called Mark, a splendid man, to whom we owe the Second Gospel and many another thing. But once when he was young he grew afraid of what they had to face, and left Paul, and went home. Afterwards he became very brave and daring, and feared nothing; and we know that, and are proud of him. And yet that old smudge of cowardice hasn't come out; and when people hear of him they think, 'Ah, that's the man who ran away.' Then there is Peter, Jesus' greatest friend, a glorious, lovable, brave man, yet once he faltered and failed through fear, that night when he was standing in the shadow where the leaping flames of the great fires in the courtyard wouldn't throw any light on his face and betray him to the soldiers, and a pert girl found him out, and when he had to speak, his accent gave him away, and he grew frightened and lied. And still, in spite of all the noble things he did before and after, when people hear of him they think, 'That is the man who denied Jesus, said he didn't know Him, failed his friend.' The smudge, even after all these years, has not rubbed off. Or even if people do forget about it and don't see it, the man himself knows, and he sees it. Who remembers that Paul, the great Christian, was once Saul who harried and killed Christ's folk? Ah! but Paul always remembered. He hated that mark upon his soul, which blackened him and burned into him, and would not come off. He was saved, but the smoky smudge was there.

Keep yourselves clean. For temper and selfishness are not things that you can wipe off, and so an end of them: they are more like a hideous accident that leaves results that never pass. Suppose a stupid fellow, let us say a miner down in the workings underground where there is gas at times and it is dangerous and no light must ever be lit, took a

craving for a smoke, struck a match, and there came a dreadful explosion, his mates would hurry to his help, they always do, would say, 'Poor Bill has been doing something foolish, but foolish or no we must get him out.' And they would do it. But at best he would be all maimed and scarred and lame for life. He would be saved, but only as by fire. And all his days he would go sore and limping, and perhaps on crutches, all for that one minute's foolishness. So you take care, look at the orange and remember that our smudges don't come off, and so make up your minds that there is going to be no temper and no selfishness for you.

The Christian Year.

SEVENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Free Gift of God.

'For the wages of sin is death; but the free gift of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord.'—Ro 6²³.

The New Testament doctrine of grace obviously depends upon its doctrine of sin. In the gospel of Jesus Christ the way of overcoming and destroying sin is revealed, but this way is valid and necessary only if the teaching of Jesus and His apostles concerning the nature of sin is essentially true.

There is in modern times a departure from the evangel of the Cross, and we find that the denial of the great message of atoning grace is partly produced by, and partly creative of, a fundamentally different conception of sin. Those who teach a more superficial method of human redemption naturally give a more superficial meaning to sin. In the evolution-gospel sin is only the 'necessary shadow of the good.' The entrance of so-called sin into the world, if it is to be called a fall at all, must be called a 'fall upwards.' We have a somewhat similar conception of sin in the 'natural divinity' theology—sin is but an accident, man is incapable of essential wrongdoing, for his nature is essentially divine. Sin does not touch the essence of human life. How little, then, can it be a cosmic disaster? And how little can it need the intervention of Divine self-sacrifice to avert the ruin? Of course a man may lie and thief and murder and wallow in unmentionable wickedness; but the thing is not fundamentally serious. It is only a holy divinity falling into an error of judgment.

Let us pass from these follies to the gospel of the

Son of God, which teaches that human sin is the essential and complete failure and disaster of the human spirit, so that nothing less than the Divine intervention in a specific work of redemption could save men from ruin.

1. *Sin is fundamentally fatal.*—'The wages of sin is death.'

The term 'wages' is here introduced in order to bring in the contrast of the next clause. As sin pays its servants the earned meed of death, so God gives men in Jesus Christ the free and unearned gift of eternal life. In the twenty-first verse the form of statement is different: 'For the end of those things is death.' The meaning clearly is, that sin is radical disaster. It inflicts death upon man's essential life. It is fundamentally fatal.

In man's deepest consciousness of sin, it is known to be essential antagonism to God. The Son of Man did not know it in Himself, but He knew it clearly and fully in others, and He declared its nature to be satanic, the essence of diabolical opposition to God and truth. Man may wrong his fellow-man, but it is in its opposition to the life of God that the act becomes sin. Hence the truly profound and awful consciousness of the penitential cry: 'Against thee, thee only, have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight.'

Sin is continuously destructive of moral fibre. Sin can be seen eating away the moral substance and fibre of life as clearly as a ravaging disease can be seen eating away the tissue and strength of the physical constitution. In the light of this fact the philosophy of sin as a 'fall upwards,' and the representation of it as a blundering effort to find God, are alike convicted of foolishness and of a refusal to look the grave facts of life honestly in the face.

The end of such a process is evident: 'The end of those things is death.' It is impossible to expound in its fullness the meaning of this 'death.' The possible references and relations of this terrible word to man's future existence have raised many controversies. Over some of these relations a dark cloud hangs, and eschatology gleams darkly from behind the veiling of God. Yet we can see and know enough to make sin appear exceedingly terrible. For this 'death', compared with physical death, is as the soul compared with the body. It is death preying on man's deepest nature, on his eternal being.

2. *God overcomes the fatal power of sin* by the free gift of eternal life.

Since sin reigns in man, and sin is the power of death, the God of redemption comes to man with the free gift of corresponding life. This cannot come as wages or as reward, for it is the first step in the overcoming of sin, and this step must be taken by the grace of God. The message of the grace of God makes appeal to that element in man which has got at the seat of power in the natural man, and is working out its ravages, little by little overcoming the natural tendencies towards good. Man can be saved from himself only by accepting the gift of all-conquering spiritual life from God.

But what is this eternal life? It is important to notice that it is not the negation of death, not, as it has often been regarded, something stored away for us in the heavens. It is a positive power by which a man is recreated, the vital incoming of new spiritual life into the human spirit. No doubt the reference of the glorious words, 'eternal life,' passes onwards into unknown meanings and developments of glory in the everlasting prospect of the saints of God; but those unimaginable glories depend upon the vital meaning which eternal life has for us here and now. Life is not an arrangement, but a power. The life eternal is not something to be received in another world, but the spiritual might which is to conquer our sin at the present time. For the spiritual and the eternal are one. The life which is given in the atonement of the Son of God is the entrance of the life of the God of redemption to take supreme command of our being. 'This is life eternal, to know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.'

God's gift of life is the beginning of new power, and therefore a call to noblest effort. Although eternal life can come only as God's free gift, yet, having come, it introduces a test of service in which the prospect of a final reward is not absent. The life itself cannot be other than a free gift, but the working out of that life into its final form of glory depends in no small measure upon our faithfulness. The warning comes to the negligent disciple, 'Hold fast that which thou hast, that no man take thy crown.' Happy the man who can say at last, 'I laboured more abundantly than they all. Yet not I, but the grace of God which was with me.'¹

¹ J. Thomas, *The Mysteries of Grace*, 144.

EIGHTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Modern Prophets.

'And Moses said unto him, Art thou jealous for my sake? would God that all the Lord's people were prophets, that the Lord would put his spirit upon them!'—Nu 11²⁹.

We read a great deal in the Old Testament about priests and prophets. They were the two leading officials in Old Testament times. The priests carried the needs of the people up to God. The prophets carried God's message down to the people. We often think of the prophets as if they were simply foretellers of the future, but as a matter of fact that was not their principal function. Their principal duty was to make known the will of God to the people. They received the message from God in various ways: sometimes in a dream, sometimes in a waking vision, sometimes through thoughts arising in their own hearts. But they knew that it was a message from God however it came, and they delivered it to the people with the authoritative words, 'Thus saith the Lord.'

Now, when Christ rose from the dead the priest and the prophet as separate officials came to an end. When the veil of the Temple was rent in twain, every worshipper had direct access to God. He had just as much right to enter the Holy of Holies as the priest had. And when the day of Pentecost arrived, and the Holy Spirit sat like a tongue of fire upon the head of every person gathered in the Upper Room, all received the gift of prophecy. From that time every follower of Christ is a priest, and every follower of Christ is a prophet. On that day there was fulfilled the wish of Moses, which is contained in our text, when he said, 'Would God that all the Lord's people were prophets.'

We are all prophets now! All the Lord's people are. That means, then, that every one of us has to receive God's message and to tell it.

1. *We have to receive God's message.* In other words, we have to learn God's will. How are we to do that? The prophets of Old Testament times received it in dreams and visions. But that is not the way He speaks to us to-day. Of course, it may be that occasionally God declares His will to us in some such abnormal way as that, but it is certainly only in very rare cases—much rarer, perhaps, than we are apt to think.

The Jews asked for signs and wonders. 'Now

when Herod saw Jesus he was exceeding glad, for he hoped to see a sign.' It was a restless curiosity, itching for the sensation of some novel entertainment; it was not the desire of a faint and weary heart hungering for bread. And Jesus answered him nothing. An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign. They seek to get evidence of the future life through merely human agencies and physical sensations, when such evidence is to be obtained only by the trusting, loving heart. They want a loud voice from the other world to tell them what lies beyond the veil, and it is not surprising that there comes back to their ears only a foolish echo of their own voice.

And not for signs in heaven above
Or earth below they look,
Who know with John His smile of love,
With Peter His rebuke.

In joy of inward peace, or sense
Of sorrow over sin,
He is His own best evidence,
His witness is within.

In order to know the will of God there are two essential things.

The first is *faith in God*; that is to say, we believe that God is righteous; anything like injustice, or cruelty, or contempt—anything of that kind is abomination to Him. The will of God is declared to us by rousing within us an abhorrence of these things, and a determination that as far as in us lies we will help to put an end to them. Examples readily occur. A man who is cruel to children or to dumb animals is not a prophet of God; he has not learned God's will. No more is a man who seeks to enslave other men—whatever form the slavery takes; it may be compelling them to work for unreasonable wages, or it may be enticing them to some vice.

The second thing is that we must have *hope for men*. We must believe in God first of all, and then we must believe in men. One of the most striking sentences in all the Bible is a sentence consisting of three words in the First Epistle of Peter, 'Honour all men.' It expresses the difference between Christianity and other religions. Could a Jew do that? How he hated the Samaritan! Could a Hindu do that? How he despises the outcasts! But do we do it? Edna Lyall, whose stories are perhaps not much read to-day, describes

one of her characters in this way. Carlo had the rare and enviable gift of seeing people as they might have been under happier circumstances, and the still rarer gift of treating them as such. The life of Christ was full of this kind of hopefulness for men. So hope for men is also essential if we are to be prophets. If we believe in God and believe in men, we shall certainly know God's will.

2. When we have learned God's will, then *we have to deliver it*. The prophet would not have been a true prophet if he had kept it to himself. Do we shrink from making God's will known to others? The prophet often shrinks from the duty of delivering his message. Jeremiah pleaded that he was an inexperienced man. 'I am a child,' he said. Jonah ran away. When he was told to go to Nineveh he took ship in the opposite direction to Tarshish. And yet no one knew the will of God better than Jonah. 'I know that thou art a gracious God,' he said, 'full of compassion, slow to anger, and plenteous in mercy.' Surely that was a knowledge that no man could keep to himself, and yet Jonah felt he would rather go anywhere than to Nineveh to declare God's will. He would rather die than do it. You remember his words: 'O Lord, take, I beseech thee, my life from me; for it is better for me to die than to live.' Of course we are not all sent to preach, as Jonah was. But if we are not sent to preach we are at least sent to talk. We can surely imitate that poor woman of Samaria, who went home and told her neighbours what Christ had said to her. It is a strange thing, when you come to think of it, that people who are bent upon attaining the same end in life—truth, goodness, and purity—should never give the slightest indication to each other in words that this is so; never allude in the presence of their best and dearest friends to that which is their chief hope and highest interest. We are all called to be prophets—not one here or there. We are all in the pulpit, for that matter. For Christ has broken down the professional barriers between priest and people. The worshippers are no longer expected to stand outside in the temple courts; they can pass into the Most Holy Place itself.

But religious conversation must, above all, be real; there must be no humbug about it—no hypocrisy, exaggeration, unreality. And there are some things in religion that are not for common talk, which a delicate, sensitive mind will no more

thrust into a conversation than it will the heart's deepest affections.

But if we cannot always talk about God, if it is sometimes inadvisable to do so—still there is one thing we can always do—one thing in which we can never go wrong. We can be prophets in our lives. And other people looking at us will confess that we have been with Jesus. The signs will be so evident.

NINTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Unrighteous Steward.

'And I say unto you, Make to yourselves friends by means of the mammon of unrighteousness; that, when it shall fail, they may receive you into the eternal tabernacles.'—Lk 16⁹.

This verse is offered as the explanation of one of the darkest of our Lord's parables, and many feel that, instead of clearing it up, the interpretation only adds to the obscurity. But the thought in the verse is further explained by the verses which follow: 'He that is faithful in a very little is faithful also in much: and he that is unrighteous in a very little is unrighteous also in much. If therefore ye have not been faithful in the unrighteous mammon, who will commit to your trust the true riches?'

If, as seems certain, these verses contain the key-thought of the parable, its drift will be essentially similar to the story of the talents which we have in Mt 25¹⁴⁻³⁰, and that of the pounds in Lk 19^{11-13, 15-26}. The real point of the teaching will be that the faithful and diligent use of lower gifts affords the training which will fit men to receive higher privileges.

There are two special thoughts in this parable. They are the need of *foresight* in the Christian life, and the *value and right use of money*.

1. *Foresight*. The difficulty of the parable is that the steward in the story was not faithful, and was (apparently) commended for his dishonesty. Why is this character given to him? The answer will probably be found in a careful study of the principles on which our Lord's parables are constructed. They are (if we may say so) works of unconscious art, in each of which there is the unity that comes of a central conception. This key-thought is thrown into the strongest possible relief by the choice of the details, which are so selected as to give it the greatest possible prominence. For instance, in Lk 18¹⁻⁸ the judge, though representing in some sense the

Heavenly Father, is depicted as an unjust, careless man. Why? Just in order to show that the perseverance of the poor widow, in the face of such difficulties, was all the more commendable. And so in this parable of the Unrighteous Steward it is the foresight, not the dishonesty, of the steward that is commended by his lord. It would be rash to say that the story could not have been so constructed as to bring out a man's foresight without making him dishonest (the story may be based upon an actual occurrence with which Jesus and His disciples were familiar); but this at least can be said, that if the man had been honest there would have been other qualities than his apparent generosity to commend him to his master's debtors, and the need for a special exercise of foresight would not have been so great. He makes friends with them by relieving them of part of their debts, in order that when he had lost his employment they might receive him into their houses.¹

2. The foresight will lead to a *right use of wealth*. The parable teaches that material wealth is not to be rejected or despised as unclean, but to be so used as to promote the highest ends. Here is a wholesome corrective to that one-sided view, based upon such passages as our Lord's words to the rich young man, that, by the Christian, wealth is neither to be used nor possessed at all, but parted with altogether. The teaching is certainly in harmony with our Lord's practice; for He had a number of well-to-do people among His followers whom He never commanded, it would appear, literally to abandon their property.

The fact that the words 'of unrighteousness' are added after mammon or riches (for mammon is only a Syriac word for riches) affords some difficulty. But probably it is as compared with the true riches that the riches of this world are called 'the mammon of unrighteousness.' What are the true riches? Those that will stay with you; those that will not fail you. Hear St. Augustine as to these: 'You have houses and lands and servants. I blame them not—you have inherited them, or you may have justly acquired them. But true riches these are not. If you call these riches, you will lose them; and if you set your heart upon them, you will perish with them. Lose, that thou be not lost. Give, that thou mayest gain.' Give, this is the teaching. There is a special message here for to-day. The

¹ Edward Grubb, *The Personality of God*, 107.

war to a large extent swept away materialism. The money standard was no longer the determinant of life. Our riches were, to some extent at least, consecrated. And now, to-day, we are in danger of forgetting our ideal of a reconstructed land with opportunities for all. What is the remedy? It is to bring home to our minds the lesson of the right use of wealth which is taught by Christ in this parable. Christ calls us, not to repudiate money as evil, but to use it only as a means to good—to consecrate our wealth. He calls us, in the words of the text, to make to ourselves friends by means of the mammon of unrighteousness.

TENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Christ as Mediator.

'For there is one God, one mediator also between God and men, himself man, Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all.'—1 Ti 2⁵.

The commentators tell us that the actual word 'mediator' is to be found only in this passage; but the idea of mediation runs right through the Bible. The Old Testament is full of mediation. There is a great deal said about the ministry of angels in the older books of the Bible. They were 'mediators,' 'go-betweens,' between God and men. And not angels only, but men also were called to this high office and mission. Moses, for instance, was the mediator between God and the people of Israel; he pleaded in the name of the people with God; he spoke as the representative and mouth-piece of God to the people. And not Moses only, but all priests and prophets were mediators, or at any rate it is true to say there was a mediatorial element in all their work and service. But all these mediators were imperfect, and their mediatorial service but partial. Paul brushes them all aside, as if they were scarcely worth reckoning, and fastens our attention exclusively on Christ, 'there is one mediator between God and men, himself man, Christ Jesus.'

What exactly is meant by the word 'mediator'? The Greek word *mesitēs*, which is here translated 'mediator,' means literally 'one who stands in the middle.' But he is one who stands in the middle for the purpose of drawing two together in a pact or covenant, or else (and here we touch the very marrow of the Pauline use of the word) he is one who stands in the middle in order to bring about

a reconciliation where there has been division or enmity.

Could any title better describe the work of Christ than this word 'mediator'? He is the great Middle-man, drawing estranged parties together into concord and peace. Throughout the centuries He has been busy at His reconciling work, filling up gulfs of distrust and hate, bridging great chasms of difference, pulling down middle walls of partition and everywhere making peace. In every sphere He has been carrying on His mediatorial activities—in the individual soul, on the field of history, between man and God. And the hope for the individual and for the world lies here—that He has not abdicated His functions. The Middle-man is still at His work. And He will not cease from it till our peace shall be like a river and our righteousness like the waves of the sea.

There are three great spheres within which Christ carries on His mediatorial work:

1. He is *Mediator between God and man*. This is the sphere within which Christ does His mightiest mediating work, and in that sphere He stands alone. The very fact that a mediator was necessary proceeds on the assumption that man was sundered far from God. About this fact there can be no dispute. All life and experience bear it out.

There are two main causes of alienation from God—ignorance and sin. Let us look first at the fact that multitudes are *separated from God by sheer ignorance*. That is the condition of the pagan world at this very moment. That was the condition of the entire world before Christ came. By its wisdom it knew not God. It could only grope after God if haply it might feel after Him and find Him. And to that wandering and alienated world Christ came, as the Mediator between God and men. The Gnostics were conscious of the vast distance that separated Almighty God from mortal man, and they tried to bridge the gulf by imagining that there was an almost endless chain of spiritual beings, the first link in the chain being only a little lower than God, the second a little lower than the first, other successive links descending in spiritual excellence by subtle shades and gradations until a being was reached who was only a little better than man. That was how the Gnostic tried to mediate by these endless genealogies of his. Paul, perhaps, has these Gnostic speculations in his mind in this

passage. He brushes them contemptuously aside. For the multitudinous æons of Gnosticism he substitutes the One Mediator, the man Christ Jesus.

This is the prophetic aspect of Christ's mediatorial work. He brought God and man together by revealing to men the character of God in His own words and life. And in this respect He is the One Mediator. If Jesus was not the Revelation of God, if He was not Himself God manifest in the flesh, then God is still a God who hides Himself. Apart from Jesus we have no right to speak of God as Father. History does not reveal 'the Father.' Nature does not reveal 'the Father.' 'No man cometh to the Father but by me.' That is our Lord's own imperious and challenging claim. Leave Christ out of account, and God will be a God afar off, and we shall be back in the night of ignorance and fear. It is in Jesus that we cease to wander in some far country; we become members of the family of God, and receive the spirit of sonship by which we cry 'Abba, Father.'

Second, there is *the separation caused by sin*, and that is the separation which Paul has in his mind in the text. Sin always results in fear and estrangement. Here is how St. Paul describes the condition of the Colossians. 'You,' he writes, 'being in time past alienated, and enemies in your mind in your evil works.' Alienated, separate, strangers, enemies! No words could set forth more vividly a complete severance. And the estrangement is mutual. Sin alienates man from God, but it also alienates God from man. Sin grieves God, it offends God, it alienates God. Listen to words like these: 'God is angry with the wicked every day.' 'The eyes of the Lord are upon the righteous; the face of the Lord is against them that do evil.' 'The wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men.' We must write a new Bible, we must for ever get rid of the words anger, wrath, consuming fire, from the descriptions of God's attitude towards men, if we are to maintain the position that alienation is only on one side.

And so, as the estrangement is twofold, the reconciliation must be twofold. Yes, Christ reconciled man to God by His Cross. In the Cross God stoops to the very death to rescue and save those who had rebelled against Him. And the vision of that mighty love changes alienation and hate into pas-

sionate devotion. We are reconciled to God by the death of His Son.

But Christ also reconciled God to man. And this also He did 'by giving Himself a ransom.' That God Himself provided the ransom makes no difference to the fact that the ransom had to be paid before man could be set free. That God Himself was 'in Christ reconciling' makes no difference to the fact that the reconciliation had to be made before God could bestow on man His forgiving and restoring grace. And Christ, again, was the Middle-man. In the Cross He represented God to man, revealing Him as a God of infinite and uttermost love; in that same Cross He represented man to God; He offered to God the sacrifice of perfect obedience, and, by bearing in His own Person the pain and penalty of sin, confessed in man's name that God's law was holy, just, and good.

2. Christ is the *Mediator between a man and his own conscience*. Sin does more than create a breach between man and God. It creates a breach between man and his own better and truer self. Sin means civil war, a divided and distracted heart; and a divided and distracted heart means misery and pain. Read the description of the civil war in that tragic seventh chapter of Romans. 'The good which I would I do not; but the evil which I would not, that I practise.' 'I delight in the law of God after the inward man; but I see a different law in my members, warring against the law of my mind.' 'Wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me out of the body of this death?' Jesus, by blotting out a man's sins, reconciles him with his better self.

3. And, in the last place, Christ is the great *Mediator between man and man*. He has stood in many a gap in the course of the centuries and closed it up. He has mediated between individuals. What marvels of reconciliation He has accomplished! Think of this simple fact—simple but tremendous in its significance—in the circle of Christ's disciples there was at one and the same time Matthew the publican and Simon the zealot—Matthew the Jew, who had entered the pay of the Roman government, and Simon, to whom every such Jew was a renegade! But Christ laid one hand on Matthew and another on Simon, and in Him the Jewish patriot and the Roman servant became friends. And when we think of the mighty achievements already wrought by Him, we can believe that before the end of the day all separations will be brought to an end, and brotherhood will

become a blessed fact, and peace and goodwill our abiding possession.

But the special message of the text for to-day is that Christ has mediated among nations and that in the long-run all national jealousies and suspicions and hates will go down before Him. There is but one mediator between nation and nation, and that is the man Christ Jesus; and He shall mediate

until war shall no more be named amongst us.¹

When peace shall over all the earth
Its ancient splendours fling,
And the whole world give back the song
Which now the angels sing.

¹ J. D. Jones, *The Hope of the Gospel*, 299.

The Apocryphal Gospels.

BY THE REVEREND ALFRED PLUMMER, D.D., FORMERLY MASTER OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, DURHAM.

II.

FROM the second to the fifth century, or even later, Apocryphal Gospels were very numerous, as is manifest from what has come down to us, and from the mention of other items by various writers. But what has come down to us is so miscellaneous, and (in the main) so fragmentary, that classification is not easy.

Various methods have been suggested. The simplest seems to be that which is based upon the *Period covered by their contents*.

Those which treat of (I.) *the Birth and Infancy of Jesus*; (II.) *His whole Life to the Resurrection*; (III.) *His Passion and Resurrection*.

I. (a) The first in this class (in more ways than one) is the *Protevangel of James* (*Proteuangelium Jacobi*). It is very early in origin, and is comparatively free from details which shock one. It maintains the absolute virginity of Mary, and it was evidently widely read and liked. Lipsius and others have remarked that it exhibits an extraordinary mixture of intimate knowledge and gross ignorance of Jewish thought and custom, showing that the legends of which it is composed come from various sources. It contains the following account of the death of Zacharias, father of the Baptist.

Herod wished to kill John with the other infants; and Elisabeth tried to hide him. She cried: 'O mountain of God, receive mother and child'; and the mountain was cleft and received her. Herod ordered Zacharias to surrender his son. He refused, and was murdered in the Temple. When he did not come out to give the usual blessing, a priest at last ventured to go in, and he saw blood beside

the altar. A voice said: 'Zacharias has been murdered, and his blood shall not be wiped up till his avenger comes.' The priest went out and brought other priests in. Then the panellings (*τὰ φανώματα*) of the Temple wailed, and the priests rent their garments from top to bottom. His body they found not; but they found his blood turned to stone.

(b) *The Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew*, a title given to it by Tischendorf. The first seventeen chapters treat of Mary from her birth to the birth of Christ. At the age of three she was mature. The birth of Christ took place in a cave. Only angels were present, and He was able to stand as soon as He was born. Salome, the midwife, would not believe in the miraculous birth until she had made examination herself. Her hand was withered, and remained withered, until she adored the Child and touched His clothing. When He was moved into the stable, the ox and the ass adored Him, in fulfilment of Is 1³. The star was the largest that had ever been seen.

The next seven chapters treat of the stay in Egypt, and have some pleasing features.

The concluding portion (26-42) deals with the return to Palestine, and attributes shocking miracles to the Child Jesus, who several times strikes other boys dead for interfering with His play, and thus provokes the wrath of the populace. Mary beseeches Him to behave otherwise. 'He, not wishing to grieve His mother, kicked the hinder parts of the dead boy, and said to him: Rise, thou son of iniquity.' The dead boy rose up and went away. And then Jesus *with a word* restores the playthings for injuring which He had killed

the boy. In a similar case, 'Jesus seized the dead boy by the ear and lifted him up from the earth . . . and he revived.' An angry schoolmaster struck Jesus, and immediately fell down dead. In this portion also there are a few benevolent miracles, such as healing the hand of his brother James when a viper bit him. Being early in origin, it became widely diffused, and was greatly liked in the East. Athanasius twice quotes the legend (ch. 23) that when Mary went into a temple in Egypt with the Child, all the idols prostrated themselves and were broken to pieces (*De Incarn.* 36 ; *Ep.* lxi. 4).

(c) *The Gospel of Thomas* (τὰ Παιδικὰ τοῦ Κυρίου) exists in three forms of different lengths, two Greek and one Latin. They repeat a number of the incidents, both pleasing and shocking, found in the *Pseudo-Matthew*, and add others ; e.g. those who complained of Him to Joseph for killing children are struck blind, and are afterwards healed.

(d) *The Arabic Gospel of the Saviour's Infancy* supplies abundant material for our purpose. Contrasts to our Gospels are numerous and glaring. A woman took the Child's navel-string¹ and put it in a jar of nard. Her son sold unguents, but she charged him never to sell this jar. 'And this is that jar which Mary (Jn 12³) the sinner (Lk 7³⁷) bought and poured upon the head and feet of our Lord Jesus Christ.' Mary gives the Magi one of the swaddling-bands. They take it home to their kings and chief men. They light a fire and worship it, and into it they throw the swaddling-band. It is found uninjured when the fire goes out. The water in which Mary had washed the Child's clothes works a variety of miracles. A young man was turned into a mule. Mary put the Child on the mule's back, 'and the mule became a young man, free from every defect.' Some boys were changed into kids. The Child said to the kids : 'Come, boys, let us go and play.' And immediately the kids were changed into boys.'

(e) *The History of Joseph the Carpenter* is a late representative of this class. It professes to have been told to the Apostles by Christ on the Mount of Olives (Mk 13³, Mt 24³, Lk 21⁵) and is extant in both the Coptic dialects and in Arabic.

¹ This is the less revolting of the two traditions. The passage runs thus : *Itaque circumciderunt illum in spelunca ; sumsitque anus illa Hebræa pelliculam istam, dicunt vero alii eam sumsisse nervum umbilicarem, eamque in ampulla olei nardini vetusti recondidit* (cap. v.).

II. The class of Gospels which treat of the whole life of our Lord is represented by various fragments and by titles of lost Gospels, which occur in Christian writers. The often-mentioned *Gospel of the Egyptians* (κατ' Αἰγυπτίους), i.e. used by Egyptian converts, belongs to this class, but it need not be discussed in connexion with our subject. Much the same may be said of *The Gospel of Peter*, an intensely interesting fragment of which was dug up at Akhmîm (Panopolis) in Upper Egypt in the winter of 1886-87. In opposition to the Canonical Gospels it represents our Lord as free from pain at the moment of Crucifixion, and as being deserted by His 'Power' at the moment of Death, when He was 'taken up' (ἀνελήφθη). This implies that the Divine Christ joined the human Christ at His Baptism, and departed from the human Christ at His death on the Cross. *The Revelation of Peter* has many other strange features, but it is an Apocalypse and not a Gospel.

III. The third class of Apocryphal Gospels, like the second, is represented mainly by fragments and titles. One complete document must be noticed on account of its importance and the title which seems to have been given to it in the Middle Ages—*The Gospel of Nicodemus*. A great deal of it has the title *Acts of Pilate*, and it is his Acts in reference to Christ which are described. We have it in three forms, two Greek and one Latin. Appended to the second Greek form is an account of Christ's Descent into Hell, two forms of which are extant in Latin. The *Acts of Pilate* are based on the four Gospels, with many apocryphal additions. The Roman standards twice bow down and adore Christ. Two remarkable replies are put into the mouth of Pilate. When the Jews said that it was not lawful for them to put any man to death, he replied : 'Has God said that you are not to put to death, but that I am ?' When they said that demons were subject to Jesus, he said : 'Why, then, were not your teachers also subject to Him ?' One MS. describes the suicide of Judas. He went home to get a rope to hang himself. His wife was roasting a cock. He tells her to prepare a rope : he has betrayed his Master, who will rise on the third day and punish His enemies. His wife replied : 'It is as likely that this cock will crow as that Jesus will rise.' Immediately the cock crowed and flapped its wings. Judas then made the halter and hanged himself.

Contributions and Comments.

The City and the Sanctuary.

IN the February EXPOSITORY TIMES Dr. W. F. Lofthouse reviews my conclusions regarding Ezk 48 as given in *The Princeton Theological Review* for July 1922. Several points require more consideration.

I. In the all-important question of the unit in the land-measurements, the LXX reading of 'cubits' in 42¹⁵⁻²⁰ is impugnable, since (a) Its insertion, in vv. 17-20 only, is suspiciously haphazard, and in contrast both to previous practice and to the purposeful character of the fourfold 'reeds with the measuring reed' of the M.T. (b) The motive for the reduction of the unit by the LXX is apparent, viz. to reconcile the dimensions of the wall with the area of Moriah. (c) The total of 500 cubits for the temple-complex E. to W. depends on a western wall 5 cubits thick (41^{12, 13}); but the surrounding wall was 6 cubits thick (40⁵): being 500 somethings long, it must have been 500 reeds. (d) In the midst of ten measurements without unit in 45¹⁻⁶ occurs one of '50 cubits': if the others are cubits, there was no object in singling out the smallest measurement to define its unit; but if the others are reeds, it was necessary to insert 'cubits' when the distance could not be expressed in reeds. (e) If the land-measurements are in cubits, the new unit of the reed, so prominently exhibited at the start, is practically never used:¹ while the two measuring instruments, the line and the reed, embarrass instead of assisting the understanding of the measurements. Is there any explanation of their provision, apart from the use of the line to measure cubits, the reed to measure reeds? (f) As the length E. to W. of Judah's portion is to correspond to the length of the oblation (48⁸), it is, if 25,000 cubits, only about 8 miles. In such circumstances to discuss whether the eastern boundary is or is not the Jordan seems a work of supererogation.

II. Dr. Lofthouse appears inclined to concede the northern position of the priests', or most holy, portion in the oblation, if it were not for 48⁸, which directs that the sanctuary be 'in the midst' of the oblation. But בְּתוֹכָהּ cannot be forced to mean

more than 'within' it: it is used in 1 K 6¹⁹ (see R.V.) of the most holy place in Solomon's temple, which occupied an extreme position corresponding to that of the northern section of the oblation. That Ezekiel did not intend to imply by the phrase the mathematical centre of the oblation, is evident from his saying that the sanctuary is 'in the midst' of the priests' portion also (v. 10); on any placing of the portions these two centres are at least 2500 units apart.

III. Dr. Lofthouse's figures concerning the land are difficult to follow. The northern boundary is not 'South of Hermon,' but the entering in of Hamath² (47²⁰ 48¹) 'between the border of Damascus and the border of Hamath' (47¹⁶), 'Damascus, northward beside Hamath' (48¹). From Damascus itself to Kadesh (47¹⁹ 48²⁸) is over 210 miles, not 'about 160 miles.' The possibility of reserving a square of 50 miles and of allotting to each of the twelve tribes a breadth of 14 miles is therefore manifest; nor is a breadth of 20 miles given to priests and to Levites respectively. By placing the temple, which is the centre of the plan, at Shechem, the centre of the country, the correct proportion of land for northern and southern tribes is secured.

IV. Exception must likewise be taken to Dr. Lofthouse's description of the sites of city and sanctuary. A city 10 miles square and centred at Bethlehem will not stretch 'right down along the defiles into the Jordan valley'; it will lie wholly upon the mountain-land, 'a city set on a hill,' none of its buildings less than 2500 feet above the Dead Sea. The site of the temple is not 'the top of Mount Ebal'; Ezekiel saw it 'on the south' of the mountain (40²), and my article consistently speaks of the site as the Vale of Shechem, an ample space for a mile-square enclosure.

V. Dr. Lofthouse makes no mention of what was described as 'in one way the most striking evidence of all'—the reference of 44⁸⁻⁹ to the uncircumcised foreigners who were offering sacrifice in the sanctuary in Israel's stead, a reference inexplicable by the history of Solomon's temple, but pointing to the

¹ After 40⁶⁻⁸, only in 41⁸: in each case 1 reed. In themselves these measurements afford no explanation of its introduction.

² Cf. Jos 13¹⁻⁵. 'There remaineth yet very much land to be possessed . . . from Baal-gad under Mount Hermon unto the entering in of Hamath.'

Assyrian subjects who were settled in Samaria, and became the ancestors of the Samaritans of Shechem.¹

VI. To refuse my conclusion from Ezekiel's premises because it appears to render unintelligible 'the glowing hopes of Deutero-Isaiah, and the conduct of the Jews of the Return,' is hasty.² The same reasoning would reject Ezekiel's premises, for admittedly he intended to remove either city or sanctuary from its former site. If the sanctuary was to remain in its old place, what of Isaiah's glowing hopes concerning Zion as the city? If, on the other hand, the sanctuary was to be moved, have we any better guide to its new position, and to the bounds of the new and enlarged Jerusalem,³ than Ezekiel's oblation plan? From the conduct of the Jews of the Return no light on the plan can be expected; they made no attempt to separate temple from city, and neither did, nor from their circumstances could, follow the land directions in any particular.

VII. Dr. Lofthouse's theory of the peripheral consciousness, involving a state of mind in which the prophet treated his native mountains as a plain, should surely be a last, not a first, resource in dealing with a passage which is at once the basis and the climax of a twelve years' mission of encouragement to 'Ye mountains of Israel'. An explanation of Ezekiel's plan which is consistent with all his directions and reveals these as neither 'hurried' nor 'ambiguous' but simple and sufficient, which agrees with the character of his writings in which the slipshod and the vague (*pace* Dr. Lofthouse) are conspicuous by their absence, which puts a positive result in place of a purely negative one, a result, too, which finds wide support both in history and in prophecy, cannot be dismissed on *a priori* grounds, or because it comes into conflict with an hypothesis of Israel's history which has never been fully proved or accepted.

C. M. MACKAY.

Glasgow.

¹ Probably the Samaritans knew nothing of Ezekiel's plan. But would it be a 'novel' and 'disturbing' conclusion if Ezekiel did appear as the father of Samaritanism? The Samaritans regarded the Pentateuch as their authority, and Ezekiel, Dr. Lofthouse holds, stood to it *in loco parentis*.

² Dr. Lofthouse inquires also concerning Hosea's attitude to Shechem. Hosea regarded the territory of Ephraim as 'the house of the Lord' (8¹), 'Mine house' (9¹⁵).

³ Cf. Ezk 16^{40, 61}, Is 33^{20, 21} 54^{2, 3}, Zec 24⁵. Ezekiel's city is evidently the 'Zion' of prophecy, his oblation the 'Jerusalem.'

Mysticism: A New Distinction.

PROFESSOR ADOLF DEISSMANN in a series of lectures, lately given in the Selly Oak Colleges, Birmingham, on *Communion with God in the Experience of Jesus* and *Communion with Christ in the Experience of Paul*, had occasion to say a good deal about mysticism. After acknowledging the difficulty which he as a German theologian felt in using the word, which might so easily be taken to be the equivalent of *mysticismus*, and thus imply the *via negativa*, he drew a distinction hitherto unnoted between Acting Mysticism and Re-acting Mysticism. While both imply 'directness of intercourse with the Deity,' in both 'an "I" speaks to a "Thou,"' unites with Him, lives, moves and has its being in Him'; the former is man's attempt to work upon God. Man's action is prior; by it he endeavours to produce the Divine re-action. In the latter it is God who works upon man. God's action is prior. Man's action is the response to the previous action of God. In the end the difference is equivalent to the contrast between the religion of works and the religion of grace. Dr. Deissmann suggested that before his conversion Paul's religion had been acting mysticism; after that event it was certainly of the re-acting type, as also was the religion of Jesus.

The lectures, which were of great interest, are to be published this autumn by Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton.

W. E. WILSON.

Selly Oak.

'A Great High Priest' (Heb. iv. 14).

I.

I ALWAYS read THE EXPOSITORY TIMES with great pleasure. In the February number (p. 235) my attention was attracted to a note on 'A Great High Priest' (He 4¹⁴).

Mr. Sherman's statements led me to consult Delitzsch's Hebrew N.T. for several passages. But the result was contrary to what the above-named note would have led one to expect. It seems to me that, when it means the acting high priest, Delitzsch translated ἀρχιερεύς by הַכֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל (e.g. Mt 26³, Jn 11^{49, 51}, Ac 22⁵ 23^{2ff.}; He 9^{7, 25} etc.). On the other hand, when deposed high priests are referred to, he translated ἀρχιερεύς by

רֹאשִׁי הַכֹּהֲנִים (e.g. Mt 2⁴ 16²¹, Jn 11⁴⁷ etc.). This is quite opposed to Mr. Sherman's contention that הכֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל means the deposed high priest, and רֹאשִׁי הַכֹּהֲנִים the acting high priest. I should be very glad to have any help to enable me to decide which view to choose.

By the way, my copy of Delitzsch's N.T. has in He 4¹⁴ כֹּהֵן רֹאשׁ גָּדוֹל נִעְלָה מְאֹד instead of כֹּהֵן גָּדוֹל which Mr. Sherman quoted.

K. BABA.

Osaka, Japan.

II.

In reply to Mr. Baba's request I would submit the following. Either הַכֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל or הַכֹּהֵן הָרִאשׁ might stand for 'high priest.' The former, which means literally 'head priest,' is undoubtedly the earlier phrase; the latter stands for the post-exilic 'high priest,' who was often as much a prince

as a priest. When, as occasionally happens, הַכֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל occurs in narratives in the Old Testament relating to pre-exilic times, its use is proleptic. There can be no doubt, I think, that Mr. Sherman in his note reverses the true order of the genesis of the phrases. Hence either רֹאשׁ or גָּדוֹל could be legitimately employed to translate ἀρχιερεύς, although the latter is naturally employed by Delitzsch for the acting high priest, as that was his generally accepted title in post-exilic times. רֹאשִׁי הַכֹּהֲנִים is quite a happy rendering of ἀρχιερεύς when it stands for deposed high priests. In spite of Mr. Sherman's ingenious argument, I venture to think it will be generally felt that in He 4¹⁴ (ἀρχιερέα μέγαν) there is no reason to understand μέγαν in any other sense than 'great' or 'greatly exalted' (Delitzsch's נִעְלָה מְאֹד).

J. A. SELBIE.

U.F. College, Aberdeen.

Entre Nous.

Sir William Robertson Nicoll.

The June number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES had already gone to press on the 4th of May before the sad news of Sir William Robertson Nicoll's death reached us. His death means the loss not only of a personal friend, but of one who from the beginning was an admirer of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Thirty-three years ago, when the first number of this magazine appeared, Dr. Nicoll was one of the first to notice it. Dr. Hastings always remembered this review gratefully. 'It was,' he said, 'one of those nippy notices which make a man rush to the first post and order his copy.' Sir William, mentioning it in *The British Weekly* last October, wrote: 'We take pleasure in thinking that we recognized the merit of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES when it was still little known.'

To appreciate the work of others and to show his appreciation in a practical way is one of the things for which Sir William will be remembered.

The last letter which we received from Sir William—at the time of Dr. Hastings' death—was a characteristic one, and we think it will not be out of place if we quote it here:

'I cannot say how much I was shocked and grieved by the most sad and unexpected news. The blow seemed to come very near. I never expected it, for when he kindly came to see us off at Aberdeen three weeks ago, he looked very well, though thin. He was full of energy, and we could have talked for hours if the train had not been ready to start.

I have tried to put a few things together for *The British Weekly*, but am not yet very well and find it difficult. He was a wonderful man—more wonderful than people thought, or than he allowed them to think. . . .

What a fertile mind, and what iron and continuous industry! For my part I have had work enough, and would gladly find an excuse to burrow in some quiet place. But we must take the way appointed for us.'

Already in this letter written nine months ago he acknowledged that he was 'not very well.' This admission from him meant a great deal, for we have never met any one who put up a braver fight against persistent bodily weakness stretching over many years.

He knew that he had work to do. He had great

and good ambitions, and so inflexible was his will that he succeeded in turning out an amazing quantity of work in spite of his constant ill-health. The secret of his enormous journalistic output over so many years was not only his determination not to give in to his physical disabilities, but was also his power of conserving his small stock of strength. Much of his work these last years was done in bed, where he would spend the day reading and dictating, getting up only in the evening to go for a short time into that amazing study, a description of which has found its way into most papers. There he would sit in his arm-chair at the far end of the narrow room, smoking at the fire with dozens of books lying on the floor beside him and others stretching to the door in long rows. The study was always the same all the years that we knew it, shelved to the ceiling and with every available shelf filled, with only a narrow path left on the floor. There in this study he would sit reading or dictating again, or perhaps seeing some of those friends who were allowed access to him and in whose conversation he delighted. As we write, we see him there as we saw him last—showing signs of weakness, a little restless, but eager and vital mentally, and full of interest in every subject, a stimulating talker and listener.

It is a month since Sir William's death, and during that time we have thought much about him. In what did his greatness lie and what contribution has he made to the thought of his generation? He was a brilliant journalist and a bookman, and perhaps he was more successful than any other in communicating his love of good books; but it is by his influence on the religious rather than on the literary thought of his age that he will be remembered.

He was an Evangelical of the Evangelicals. Not that his faith was narrow. What he believed he believed with understanding, and he believed also with passion. And somehow the emotional quality of his belief affected his readers—and they were found in all parts of the world—profoundly, so that to them too the Atonement of Christ became a living fact.

This is no small thing to have done.

We are glad to think that he was able to remain editor of *The British Weekly* to the last, and that during the final months he had the assistance not only of Miss Stoddart, who had been associated

with him for so many years, but also of his successor, the Rev. J. M. E. Ross.

The Speaker's Bible.

We have not written about *The Speaker's Bible* before in *Entre Nous*. But we must do so now to remove a misunderstanding. Several of our correspondents take for granted that the matter of *The Speaker's Bible* has already appeared in *THE EXPOSITORY TIMES*. But this is not so. The whole of *The Speaker's Bible* is entirely distinct from 'The Christian Year.'

The Speaker's Bible was the last work on which Dr. Hastings was engaged. It was his intention to deal with the whole Bible, but before his death he had accomplished only a certain amount of the work planned. Fortunately, he left MSS sufficient for at least four years' publication at the rate of two to three volumes a year.

The Speaker's Bible is being issued in serial form.

The first four monthly numbers completed the *Epistle to the Hebrews*. This has been issued in volume form also. The next five monthly numbers dealt with the first portion of St. Luke's Gospel. These were issued in volume form in June as *St. Luke, Volume I*. St. Luke's Gospel is one of the books that was not finished. Dr. Hastings was indeed working on it up to a few days before his death. There is, however, sufficient material for at least another volume, which should appear about the end of the year. St. Luke will be followed by an Old Testament book—probably *Deuteronomy*.

The Speaker's Bible is published in monthly numbers of 96 pages at 2s. A page contains about 800 words, a Number about 76,800 words. For the Serial Issue application should be made direct to 'The Speaker's Bible Office,' Aberdeen.

Special terms have been arranged for six-monthly and yearly subscribers at 11s. and 22s. respectively.

The price of the volumes varies according to size. The price of *The Epistle to the Hebrews* is 9s. 6d. net. That of *St. Luke's Gospel, Volume I*, is 12s. 6d. net. The volumes may be obtained either direct or through any bookseller. The serial numbers and the first volumes are meeting with an enthusiastic reception. Up till now they have not been sent for review, but next month we hope to have space to quote some of the appreciations which have been pouring in from subscribers.

TWO TEXTS.

Matt. xxv. 27.

'WHAT Christ meant by the remarkable words "placed my money with the bankers" it is hard to define precisely, though we may gather that their general drift is that where direct opportunities for the use of our talents are not open for us, indirect opportunities for service will never be wanting in the kingdom of God, if we are only in earnest in the wish to use them. In the service of the kingdom there is not only room for, but there is need of, all men that are willing and eager to use their talents in the position to which God has called or shall call them, whether as with the vast majority they have no duties beyond the narrow circle of the household or the circumscribed routine of their daily occupation, or with the exceptional few their lives form large factors in the history of the nation.'¹

Luke xv. 16.

'The longing of the prodigal for husks or carob-pods pictures the intensity of his hunger, and his feeding of swine the shamefulness of his servitude as a son of Abraham. He would fain have been filled with the husks, not "filled his belly," as the Authorized Version has it, for he could easily have done that, but the right reading, as in the Revised Version, denotes that he would fain have been filled—that is, satisfied with the husks that the swine did eat. The same words "to be filled" are used in Lk 6²¹, "Blessed are ye that hunger: for ye shall be filled"—that is, satisfied to the full. But no such satisfaction was to be procured in the far country, only servitude and a famine of all that whereon the soul of man can live.'²

SOME TOPICS.

False Fear of God.

"The total nature of reality" defies the philosopher to-day as utterly as it has defied the philosophers of all ages. He has no word which is really adequate even to soothe that grovelling fear of the unseen forces of the universe to which mankind is prone, and which has been the prolific root of dark, inhuman heathenisms. Sometimes, indeed, one is almost driven to wonder whether heathenism's

deadly wound may not be healed; whether out of blind fear may not be born anew dreadful attempts at propitiation. There have been recrudescences scarcely less strange. And beyond all question there is a distinct, unwonted tendency nowadays to view as sinister the regnant Power of the universe. Defiant arraignment of the Higher than man furnishes to the literature of our time one of its most characteristic notes; often taking shape in blasphemies almost unquotable. "The hidden God who does not wish to give up his secrets strikes down men who seek to take them!" a French surgeon, dying from the effects of prolonged experimentation with the X-ray, was quoted, not long ago, as saying. Who can fail to feel in the words that which makes the very essence of heathenism? There is a fear of God which is not "the beginning of wisdom," but a blight, rather, on all that is highest and best in life: a craven fear, degrading to man, dishonoring to God; which it is the work of "perfect love" to cast out.'

This quotation is from *The Deeper Voice*, by Miss Annie Steger Winston (Doran; \$1.25 net). The aim of the book is to point to childlikeness in the spiritual realm as 'the one remedy for the twin evils of blank pessimism and arid rationalism.'

Jesus the Wanderer.

'Jesus was a wanderer, what the well-to-do citizen of sedentary habits lounging in his doorway would call a vagabond. His life was one long journey. Before that other—who was condemned to immortality by One who was Himself condemned to death—Jesus was the true Wandering Jew. He was born on a journey, born not even at an inn, for there was no room available at Bethlehem for the pilgrim who was with child. While still at the breast He was carried along the interminable sun-scorched roads that lead into Egypt; from Egypt He returned to the waters and verdure of Galilee. From Nazareth He went frequently to Jerusalem for the Passover. John's voice called Him to the banks of the Jordan; an inner voice called Him to the desert. And after the forty days of fasting and temptation He began His restless wandering from town to town, from village to village, from hill-top to hill-top, throughout this much-divided Palestine. Oftenest we find Him in His native Galilee, at Capernaum, at Chorazin, at Cana, at Magdala, at Tiberias. But He crosses also Samaria, and loves to

¹ R. H. Charles, *The Adventure into the Unknown*, 75.

² *Ibid.* 166.

sit by the well at Sychar. We find Him also in the tetrarchy of Philip, at Bethsaida in the land of the Gadarenes, at Cæsarea, and even at Gerasa in Peræa of Herod Antipas. When in Judea He prefers to stop at Bethany, a few miles from Jerusalem, or at Jericho. But He does not hesitate to cross the boundaries of the ancient kingdom and go down among the Gentiles. We meet Him, in fact, in Phœnicia near Tyre and Sidon, and in Syria also, for His Transfiguration takes place on Mount Hermon. After His Resurrection He appears at Emmaus on the shores of the Sea of Tiberias, and it was finally at Bethany, near the house of him whom He had raised from the dead, that He took leave of His friends for ever.

He was the wanderer who never rested, the homeless wanderer, the wanderer for love, the voluntary exile from His own land. He Himself tells us that He has not one stone whereon to lay His head; and it is true that He possesses no couch whereon He may rest at night, nor a house He may call His own. His true home is the road He travels with His earliest followers, in search of new friends. His bed is a furrow in the fields, a bench in a boat, the shade of an olive-tree. At times He rests under the roof of a loving friend, but He is ever a passing guest whose visit is brief.¹

Why Jesus called Fishermen.

'It was not by chance that Jesus chose His first followers from among fishermen. The fisherman who spends the greater part of his days in solitude and encompassed by pure waters is *the man who knows how to wait*. He is the man of patience who is not pressed for time; who casts his net and leaves the rest to the Almighty. Water has its moods and the lake its fancies, and his days are never monotonous. On setting forth the fisherman knows not whether he will return with his boat full or without a single fish to cook for his evening meal. He places himself in God's hands, who sends both abundance and want. When times are hard he consoles himself with the thought of past times that were better and of better times to come. He does not seek to make money rapidly, and he is happy if he can but barter the fruits of his toil for a little bread and wine. He is clean both in mind and body, for his hands are washed in the waters of the lake and his spirit in those of solitude.'²

How the Mind influences the Body.

'The idea of discomfort creates discomfort. Two young students of the same faculty occupied the same room, probably for reasons of economy. One of them one night, worn out, no doubt, by overwork, felt himself choking for want of air and called his friend to his help. He, suddenly awakened, without taking time to think, seized the first thing that came into his hands and flung it at the window. There was a shower of falling glass and the choking student at once began to breathe easily. What was their astonishment next morning to find that it was not the glass of the window but the glass of the wardrobe that had been shattered to atoms.'³

NEW POETRY.

A. M. P. Dawson.

St. Phocas, and Other Poems (Swarthmore Press; 3s. 6d. net), is a small volume of poetry from the pen of Mr. A. M. P. Dawson. Some of the poems are of a religious nature. About one quarter are peace poems written during the War. All are serious and earnest. There are one or two descriptive poems, the longest being the one which gives its title to the book, *St. Phocas*; and *St. Phocas*, we are told, is the Gardener-Saint of Greece. The author makes large use of the sonnet form and is there at his best. We quote the sonnet on

DEATH.

This faith is mine: that when earth yields her hold
I shall renew my youth in Death's pure stream,
And my freed soul shall sing a springtide theme,
Braver yet sweeter, wiser yet more bold,
Than e'er I sang in the brave springs of old
When all the world was gladsome as a gleam
Of dancing sunlight, golden as the dream
That makes the first fair April buds unfold.
I shall awake to music, and to mirth,
To fragrance and the joys of growth and hope,
To vernal faith and love and ampler scope,
To beauty, homelike with dear hints of earth,
And thus shall Death be but a greater birth,
Of this life's edifice the crowning cope.

³ A. Dolonne, *Self-Healing by Autosuggestion*, 54.

¹ G. Papini, *The Story of Christ*, 63.

² *Ibid.* 73.